

of his committee during the year. The Executive Committee shall take the necessary action on these reports.

SEC. 2. Nominations for the committees listed in Section 1 shall be submitted to the annual convention by the Council.

ARTICLE V.

ANNUAL DUES

SECTION 1. The annual dues of each active member shall be twenty-five dollars.

SEC. 2. The annual dues of associate members shall be ten dollars.

SEC. 3. The annual dues of allied members shall be twenty-five dollars, but no dues shall be required of an allied member when a majority of its constituents are also members of this Association.

ARTICLE VI.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

At meetings of this Association, the order of business shall be as follows:

- (1) Reading of minutes of previous meeting;
- (2) Appointment of a Committee on Credentials;
- (3) Appointment of a Committee on Nominations;
- (4) Reports of officers and committees;
- (5) Miscellaneous business;
- (6) Election of officers and committees;
- (7) Adjournment.

ARTICLE VII.

ELIGIBILITY RULES

The acceptance of a definite set of eligibility rules shall not be a requirement of membership in this Association. The constituted authorities of each institution shall decide on the methods necessary to uphold the law of amateurism and to carry out the principles of sport as enunciated in Article VII of the Constitution.

ARTICLE VIII.

AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting at any annual convention of this Association, provided that notice of the proposed amendment shall have been sent at least three weeks before the date of the meeting to the institutions enrolled.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COL- LEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 27-28, 1934

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Officers of the Association - - - - -	2
Rules Committees for 1935 - - - - -	3
Roll of Members - - - - -	6
Delegates and Visitors present - - - - -	13
Proceedings of Convention of 1934 - - - - -	16
Reports of Districts - - - - -	19
Reports of Rules Committees:	
Association Football (Soccer) - - - - -	43
Basketball - - - - -	44
Fencing - - - - -	45
Football - - - - -	46
Gymnastics - - - - -	50
Ice Hockey - - - - -	50
Lacrosse - - - - -	51
Swimming - - - - -	52
Track and Field - - - - -	57
Wrestling - - - - -	63
Reports of Special Committees:	
Federal Admissions Tax - - - - -	68
Recruiting and Subsidizing - - - - -	69
Eligibility of Junior College Students - - - - -	71
Addresses at the Convention:	
Presidential Address—John L. Griffith - - - - -	75
Robert F. Kelley - - - - -	80
Dana X. Bible - - - - -	86
Dean Herbert E. Hawkes - - - - -	90
Dean Fraser Metzger - - - - -	96
Report of Round Table on Recruiting and Subsidizing - - - - -	101
Report of Treasurer for 1934 - - - - -	117

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1935

HONORARY PRESIDENTS

Brigadier General Palmer E. Pierce, Room 1616, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Professor Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

PRESIDENT

Major J. L. Griffith, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill.

SECRETARY-TREASURER

Professor Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

COUNCIL

(In addition to the President and Secretary the following vice-presidents, *ex officio*.)

First District, President Tyler Dennett, Williams College.
Second District, Dean R. L. Sackett, Penn. State College.
Third District, Professor W. C. Smith, Tulane University.
Fourth District, Professor C. L. Eddy, Case School of Applied Science.
Fifth District, Professor H. H. King, Kansas State College.
Sixth District, Professor E. W. McDiarmid, Texas Christian University.
Seventh District, Professor J. C. Fitterer, Colorado School of Mines.
Eighth District, Professor H. C. Willett, University of Southern California.

Members at Large*

Dr. J. E. Raycroft, Princeton University.
Director W. J. Bingham, Harvard University.
Professor L. W. St. John, Ohio State University.
Mr. Romeyn Berry, Cornell University.
Dean E. L. Mercer, University of Pennsylvania.
Director R. A. Fetzner, University of North Carolina.
Professor W. B. Owens, Stanford University.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The president and secretary, *ex officio*
Dean R. L. Sackett Professor L. W. St. John Dr. J. E. Raycroft
Director W. J. Bingham Dean E. L. Mercer Mr. Romeyn Berry
Professor P. O. Badger

* Elected by the Council.

RULES COMMITTEES FOR 1935

For football, basketball, and track rules the figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 before the name of a member of a committee indicate that the individual in question is to serve one, two, three, or four years, beginning this year.

Association Football Rules

H. W. Clark, Harvard University; A. W. Marsh, Amherst College; Douglas Stewart, University of Pennsylvania; Burnham M. Dell, Princeton University.

Advisory Committee: James McPete, Haverford College; N. M. Fleming, Penn. State College; S. C. Staley, University of Illinois; H. W. Maloney, Stanford University; C. S. Moll, Kansas State College; Robert Dunn, Swarthmore College.

Basketball Rules

L. W. St. John, Ohio State University; Oswald Tower (editor), Andover Academy; Jas. A. Naismith, Life Member, University of Kansas; (1) H. H. Salmon, Jr., 2nd district; J. F. Bohler, 8th district; (2) W. McK. Barber, 1st district; Forrest C. Allen, 5th district; (3) Henry Crisp, 3rd district; James St. Clair, 6th district; (4) W. E. Meanwell, 4th district; Willard Witte, 7th district.

Boxing Rules

Hugo Bezdek, Penn. State College; James G. Driver, University of Virginia; Wm. H. Cowell, University of New Hampshire; Lieut. J. B. McInerney, U. S. Military Academy; Lt. Com. J. H. Brown, Jr., U. S. Naval Academy; I. F. Toomey, University of California.

Fencing Rules

Hugh V. Alessandroni, Columbia University; John H. Hanway, Yale University; Samuel J. Cole, Mass. Institute of Technology; Harold Van Buskirk, University of Pennsylvania; Royall H. Snow, Ohio State University.

Advisory Committee: One to be appointed from the 8th district.

Football Rules

Walter R. Okeson, Lehigh University, Chairman; W. S. Langford, 30 Maiden Lane, New York City, Secretary; A. A. Stagg, Life Member; (1) W. J. Bingham, 1st district; D. X. Bible, 5th district; (2) H. J. Stegeman, 3rd district; F. H. Yost, 4th district; (3) Ray Morrison, 6th district; W. O. Hunter, 8th district; (4) W. G. Crowell, 2nd district; L. Mahoney, 7th district.

Gymnastic Rules

Christopher A. Beling, 111 Clinton Ave., Newark, N. J.; D. L. Hoffer, University of Chicago; C. W. Graydon, Flushing, N. Y.; John A. Davis, Stevens Institute of Technology.

Advisory Committee: Roy Moore, New York University; E. G. Schroeder, University of Iowa; Harry Maloney, Stanford University; Claude Simons, Tulane University; Fred W. Ball, Princeton University.

Ice Hockey Rules

Albert I. Prettyman, Hamilton College; J. Edward Lowrey, University of Michigan; Louis F. Keller, University of Minnesota; Joseph Stubbs, Harvard University; Joseph O. Bulkley, Yale University.

Advisory Committee: L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College; Rev. F. H. Sill, O.H.C., Kent School; Donald D. Sands, Boston, Mass.; Lt. E. S. Molitor, U. S. Military Academy; F. A. Haist, Cornell University.

Lacrosse Rules

L. J. Korn, Swarthmore College; R. D. Root, Yale University; Roy Simons, Syracuse University; H. J. Rockefeller, Rutgers College; Kenneth Fairman, Princeton University; John Faber, University of Maryland.

Advisory Committee: L. B. Johnston, Dartmouth College; J. B. Crenshaw, Georgia School of Technology; T. B. Davies, Colorado College.

Swimming Rules

F. W. Luehring, University of Pennsylvania; A. E. Eilers, Washington University; R. J. H. Kiphuth, Yale University; Neils Thorpe, University of Minnesota; J. S. Ulen, Harvard University; C. E. Forsythe, High School Federation.

Advisory Committee: Frank Wall, New York University; C. J. Alderson, University of Texas; E. McGillivray, University of Chicago; Charles Welch, University of Utah; Ernest Brandsten, Stanford University; Fred Cady, University of Southern California; A. Y. Russell, Drake University; T. K. Cureton, Springfield College; Ray Daughters, University of Washington; Mike Peppe, Ohio State University.

Track Rules

T. N. Metcalf, University of Chicago; (1) H. J. Huff, 5th district; Dean Cromwell, 8th district; (2) Clyde Littlefield, 6th district; Harry Hillman, 1st district; (3) R. A. Fetzer, 3rd district; H. W. Hughes, 7th district; (4) K. L. Wilson, 4th district; Lawson Robertson, 2nd district.

Wrestling Rules

R. G. Clapp, University of Nebraska; J. A. Rockwell, Mass. Institute of Technology; C. P. Miles, Virginia Polytechnic Institute; D. B. Swingle, Montana State College; C. F. Foster, Princeton University; E. G. Schroeder, University of Iowa; P. E. Wiggins, High School Federation.

Advisory Committee: C. J. Gallagher, Harvard University; E. C. Gallagher, Oklahoma A. & M. College; Walter Franklin, University of Colorado; Maj. H. M. Read, Virginia Military Institute; Wm. Sheridan, Lehigh University; R. J. McLean, University of Texas; H. A. Stone, University of California; Hugo Otopolik, Iowa State College; J. Hancock, Colorado Teachers College.

ROLL OF MEMBERS

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

First District

Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., Stanley King, LL.D., President.
 Bates College, Lewiston, Maine, Clifton D. Gray, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Boston College, Boston, Mass., Rev. Louis J. Gallagher, Ph.D., President.
 Boston University, Boston, Mass., Daniel L. Marsh, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, Kenneth C. M. Sills, LL.D., President.
 Brown University, Providence, R. I., Clarence A. Barbour, S.T.D., LL.D., President.
 Connecticut State College, Storrs, Conn., Charles C. McCracken, Ph.D., President.
 Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., Ernest M. Hopkins, LL.D., President.
 Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., James B. Conant, Ph.D., President.
 International Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass., L. L. Doggett, Ph.D., President.
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., Karl T. Compton, Sc.D., President.
 Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass., Hugh P. Baker, M.F., President.
 Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., Paul Dwight Moody, D.D., President.
 Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., Porter H. Adams, President.
 Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I., Raymond G. Bressler, M.S., President.
 Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., Rev. Remsen B. Ogilby, LL.D., President.
 Tufts College, Medford, Mass., John A. Cousens, LL.D., President.
 United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., Capt. Randolph Ridgely, Jr., U. S. C. G., Superintendent.
 University of Maine, Orono, Me., Arthur A. Hauck, Ph.D., President.
 University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H., Edward M. Lewis, LL.D., President.
 University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., Guy W. Bailey, LL.D., President.
 Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., James L. McConaughy, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., Tyler Dennett, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass., Captain Ralph Earle, U.S.N., President.
 Yale University, New Haven, Conn., James Rowland Angell, Litt.D., President.

Second District

Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y., J. Nelson Norwood, Ph.D., President.
 Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., William P. Tolley, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y., Parke R. Kolbe, Ph.D., President.

Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa., Thomas S. Baker, Ph.D., President.
 Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, N. Y., James Shelby Thomas, M.A., President.
 Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., George B. Cutten, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., President.
 College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y., Frederick B. Robinson, Ph.D., President.
 Columbia University, New York, N. Y., Nicholas Murray Butler, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., Livingston Farrand, M.D., LL.D., President.
 Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., Fred P. Corson, D.D., President.
 Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., Rev. J. J. Callahan, LL.D., President.
 Fordham University, New York, N. Y., Rev. A. J. Hogan, Ph.D., President.
 Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., Henry H. Apple, D.D., LL.D., President.
 Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa., McLeod M. Pearce, D.D., President.
 Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., Henry W. A. Hanson, D.D., LL.D., President.
 Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., Frederick C. Ferry, Sc.D., LL.D., President.
 Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., W. W. Comfort, Ph.D., Litt.D., President.
 Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., Murray Bartlett, D.D., LL.D., President.
 Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., William M. Lewis, LL.D., President.
 Lehigh University, S. Bethlehem, Pa., Charles R. Richards, E.M., LL.D., President.
 Manhattan College, New York, N. Y., Brother Patrick, President.
 New York University, New York, N. Y., Harry W. Chase, Ph.D., LL.D., Chancellor.
 Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa., Frank K. Hyatt, LL.D., President.
 Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa., Ralph D. Hetzel, LL.D., Litt.D., President.
 Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., Harold W. Dodds, Ph.D., President.
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y., Palmer C. Ricketts, C.E., LL.D., President.
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., Robert C. Clothier, LL.D., President.
 St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y., Richard Eddy Sykes, M.S., D.D., President.
 State Teachers College, West Chester, Pa., Norman W. Cameron, Ph.D., President.
 Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J., H. N. Davis, Ph.D., President.
 Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa., Rev. G. Morris Smith, D.D., President.
 Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., Frank Aydelotte, LL.D., D.Litt., President.
 Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., Charles W. Flint, D.D., LL.D., Chancellor.
 Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., Charles E. Beury, LL.B., President.
 Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., Dixon R. Fox, Ph.D., President.
 United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., Major General W. D. Connor, U.S.A., Superintendent.
 University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., Samuel P. Capen, Ph.D., President.
 University of Delaware, Newark, Del., Walter Hulihan, Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., President.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., Thomas S. Gates, LL.D., President.
 University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., John G. Bowman, LL.D., Chancellor.
 University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., Rush Rhees, D.D., LL.D., President.
 Villanova College, Villanova, Pa., Rev. E. V. Stanford, LL.D., President.
 West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., John R. Turner, Ph.D., President.

Third District

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala., Marion J. Funchess, M.S., Dean.
 Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., Right Rev. James H. Ryan, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Centenary College, Shreveport, La., Pierce Cline, M.A., President.
 Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S. C., Enoch W. Sikes, Ph.D., President.
 Duke University, Durham, N. C., William P. Few, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., Rev. W. C. Nevils, Ph.D., President.
 Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga., Marion L. Brittain, LL.D., President.
 Howard University, Washington, D. C., Mordecai W. Johnson, D.D., President.
 John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla., William S. Allen, Ph.D., President.
 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., Joseph S. Ames, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Loyola University, New Orleans, La., J. W. Hynes, S.J., D.D., President.
 Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., Monsignor B. J. Bradley, LL.D., President.
 Tulane University, New Orleans, La., A. B. Dinwiddie, LL.D., President.
 United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., Rear Admiral Thomas C. Hart, U.S.N., Superintendent.
 University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., John J. Tigert, D.C.L., LL.D., President.
 University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., S. V. Sanford, Litt.D., President.
 University of Maryland, College Park, Md., Raymond A. Pearson, LL.D., D. Agr., President.
 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., Frank P. Graham, LL.D., D.C.L., President.
 University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., Benjamin F. Finney, LL.D., President.
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn., James D. Hoskins, LL.B., President.
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., John L. Newcomb, B.A., C.E., President.
 Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., J. H. Kirkland, Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Chancellor.
 Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., Francis P. Gaines, Ph.D., Litt.D., President.

Fourth District

Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill., Frederic R. Hamilton, Ph.D., President.
 Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind., James W. Putnam, Ph.D., Acting President.
 Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., Donald J. Cowling, D.D., LL.D., President.

Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio, William E. Wickenden, Sc.D., President.
 Denison University, Granville, Ohio, Avery A. Shaw, D.D., President.
 DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind., G. Bromley Oxnam, D.D., President.
 Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., William L. Bryan, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., Albert Britt, Litt.D., President.
 Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., Henry M. Wriston, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., William M. Magee, S.J., LL.D., President.
 Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Alfred H. Upham, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., Robert S. Shaw, B.S.A., President.
 Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich., Charles McKenny, LL.D., President.
 Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Walter D. Scott, Ph.D., President.
 Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Ernest H. Wilkins, Ph.D., President.
 Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, George W. Rightmire, M.A., President.
 Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, Edwin W. Chubb, Litt.D., LL.D., President.
 Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, Edmund D. Soper, D.D., President.
 Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., Edward C. Elliott, Ph.D., President.
 University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., Robert M. Hutchins, LL.D., President.
 University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., Albert H. Poetker, LL.D., President.
 University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., Arthur C. Willard, LL.D., President.
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., Alexander G. Ruthven, Ph.D., President.
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., Lotus D. Coffman, Ph.D., President.
 University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., Rev. J. F. O'Hara, C.S.C., President.
 University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., Glenn Frank, Litt.D., LL.D., President.
 Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich., Dwight B. Waldo, LL.D., President.
 Wooster College, Wooster, Ohio, Charles F. Wishart, D.D., President.

Fifth District

Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Harry M. Gage, LL.D., President.
 Creighton University, Omaha, Neb., Rev. P. J. Mahan, LL.D., President.
 Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, Daniel W. Morehouse, Ph.D., President.
 Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, John S. Nollen, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, Raymond M. Hughes, LL.D., President.
 Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., F. D. Farrell, Agr.D., President.
 Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Okla., Henry G. Bennett, Ph.D., President.
 State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, Eugene A. Gilmore, LL.D., President.
 University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., Ernest H. Lindley, Ph.D., Chancellor.

University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., Frederick A. Middlebush, Ph.D., Acting President.
 University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb., Edgar A. Burnett, Sc.D., Chancellor.
 University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., W. B. Bizzell, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans., William M. Jardine, LL.D., President.
 Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., G. R. Throop, Ph.D., Chancellor.

Sixth District

Baylor University, Waco, Texas, Pat M. Neff, LL.D., President.
 Rice Institute, Houston, Texas, Edgar O. Lovett, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, C. C. Selecman, D.D., President.
 Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, College Station, Texas, Thomas O. Walton, LL.D., President.
 University of Texas, Austin, Texas, H. Y. Benedict, Ph.D., LL.D., President.

Seventh District

Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Col., Charles A. Lory, LL.D., Sc.D., President.
 University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., George Norlin, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, George Thomas, Ph.D., President.

Eighth District

Oregon State College, Corvallis, Ore., G. W. Peavy, President.
 Stanford University, Stanford University, Cal., Ray Lyman Wilbur, Sc.D., LL.D., President.
 State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash., Ernest O. Holland, Ph.D., President.
 University of California, Berkeley, Cal., Robert G. Sproul, LL.D., President.
 University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore., C. Valentine Boyer, Ph.D., President.
 University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal., R. B. von Kleinsmid, Sc.D., LL.D., President.
 University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., Hugo A. Winkenwerder, M.F., Acting President.

ALLIED MEMBERS

Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia	Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg
Fort Hays Kansas State College	Municipal University of Wichita
	Southwestern College

Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association, comprising:

Bluefield State Teachers College	St. Augustine's College
Hampton Institute	St. Paul Normal and Industrial School
Howard University	Shaw University
Lincoln University	Johnson C. Smith University
Morgan College	Virginia State College
North Carolina A. & T. College	Virginia Union University
North Carolina State College	

Kansas College Athletic Association, comprising:

Bethany College	Ottawa University
St. Mary's College	McPherson College
Baker University	Kansas Wesleyan University

Middle Atlantic States College Athletic Conference, comprising:

Bucknell University	Muhlenberg College
Columbia University	New York University
University of Delaware	University of Pennsylvania
Drexel Institute	Pennsylvania Military College
Franklin and Marshall College	Princeton University
Gettysburg College	Rutgers University
Haverford College	Stevens Institute
Johns Hopkins University	Susquehanna University
Juniata College	Ursinus College
Lebanon Valley College	Washington College
Lehigh University	

Mid-West Collegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Beloit College	Knox College
Carleton College	Lawrence College
Coe College	Monmouth College
Cornell College	Ripon College

Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association, comprising:

Iowa State College	University of Missouri
Kansas State Agricultural College	University of Nebraska
University of Kansas	University of Oklahoma

Missouri Valley Conference, comprising:

Butler University	Grinnell College
Creighton University	Oklahoma A. & M. College
Drake University	Washington University

Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Oregon Agricultural College	University of Oregon
Stanford University	University of Southern California
State College of Washington	University of Washington
State University of Montana	University of California, at Los Angeles
University of California	
University of Idaho	

Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference, comprising:

University of Colorado	Utah Agricultural College
Colorado State School of Mines	Colorado Agricultural College
Colorado College	Colorado State Teachers College
University of Denver	Western State Teachers College
Brigham Young University	Montana State College
University of Utah	University of Wyoming

Southern Conference, comprising:

Clemson College	University of South Carolina
Duke University	University of Virginia
University of Maryland	Virginia Military Institute
North Carolina State College	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
University of North Carolina	Washington and Lee University

Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Morehouse College	Clark University
Morris Brown University	Florida A. & M. College
Alabama State Teachers College	Knoxville College
Talladega College	Fisk University
Tuskegee Institute	Le Moyne College
Benedict College	S. Carolina A. & M. College

Southeastern Conference, comprising:

University of Alabama	Mississippi A. & M. College
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	University of Mississippi
University of Florida	University of the South
Georgia School of Technology	University of Tennessee
University of Georgia	Tulane University
University of Kentucky	Vanderbilt University
Louisiana State University	

Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

California Institute of Technology	San Diego State Teachers College
Occidental College	University of Redlands
Pomona College	Whittier College
La Verne College	Santa Barbara State Teachers College

Southwest Athletic Conference, comprising:

Baylor University	Texas University
Rice Institute	University of Arkansas
Southern Methodist University	Texas Christian University
A. & M. College of Texas	

Western Conference, comprising:

University of Chicago	University of Minnesota
University of Illinois	Northwestern University
University of Indiana	Ohio State University
University of Iowa	Purdue University
University of Michigan	University of Wisconsin

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Andover Academy, Andover, Mass.
Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pa.
Rochester Mechanics Institute, Rochester, N. Y.

LIST OF DELEGATES AND VISITORS AT THE TWENTY-NINTH CONVENTION

I. FROM MEMBER INSTITUTIONS:

Alfred University: J. A. McLane, J. E. Galloway.
Allegheny College: H. P. Way.
Amherst College: A. W. Marsh, A. G. Wheeler.
Bates College: O. F. Cutts.
Boston College: F. V. Sullivan, J. P. Curley.
Boston University: J. M. Harmon, G. V. Brown.
Bowdoin College: M. E. Morrell, H. L. Johnson, D. D. Lancaster, L. S. Wells.
Brown University: S. T. Arnold, F. W. Marvel, L. E. Swain, T. W. Taylor.
Carnegie Institute: Clarence Overend.
Case School of Applied Science: C. L. Eddy.
Colgate University: J. H. Starr.
College of the City of New York: G. E. Goss.
Columbia University: E. S. Elliott, W. L. Hughes.
Connecticut State College: W. H. Kinsey, J. O. Christian.
Cornell University: H. Diederichs, R. Berry, C. V. P. Young, W. L. Conwell.
Creighton University: A. A. Schabinger.
Dartmouth University: R. J. Delahanty, H. Hillman.
Denison University: W. J. Livingston.
Dickinson College: J. H. McCormick.
Duke University: W. H. Wannamaker, C. M. Voyles.
Duquesne University: C. Flanagan.
Fordham University: Rev. C. J. Deane, S. J., J. F. Coffey.
Georgetown University: Rev. J. J. Kehoe, H. G. Murphy.
Gettysburg College: C. E. Bilheimer.
Grinnell College: E. D. Strong, J. C. Truesdale, L. L. Watt.
Hamilton College: F. H. Ristine, A. I. Prettyman, J. M. Gélas, A. R. Winters, M. A. Weber.
Harvard University: W. J. Bingham, H. W. Clark, A. W. Samborski, N. W. Fradd.
Haverford College: A. MacIntosh, H. T. Brown, Jr., A. Evans, A. W. Haddleton.
Hobart College: F. L. Krams, E. B. Wilson.
Howard University: C. W. Davis, W. Parris.
Indiana University: Z. G. Clevenger, E. C. Hayes, A. N. McMillin.
International Y. M. C. A. College: G. B. Affleck, J. H. McCurdy, H. S. DeGroat, J. L. Rothacher, E. W. Pennock, J. D. Brock, B. P. Sargeant, Jr.
Johns Hopkins University: G. W. Shaffer.
Kansas State College: H. H. King.
Lafayette College: T. A. Distler, H. A. Lorenz, D. L. Reeves, J. F. Magee.
Lehigh University: W. R. Okeson.
Marquette University: C. M. Jennings.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: J. A. Rockwell, H. E. Lobdell.
Massachusetts State College: M. H. Taube.
Miami University: G. L. Rider, F. Wilton.
Michigan State College: R. C. Huston, R. H. Young, T. H. King, C. W. Bachman, M. W. Casteel.

Middlebury College: A. M. Brown, B. H. Beck, W. J. Nelson.
 New York University: P. O. Badger, F. P. Wall.
 Northwestern University: O. F. Long, K. L. Wilson.
 Oberlin College: C. W. Savage, J. H. Nichols, L. K. Butler.
 Ohio State University: T. E. French, L. W. St. John.
 Ohio Wesleyan: C. E. Gauthier, F. C. Mackey.
 Pennsylvania Military College: J. Timm.
 Pennsylvania State College: R. L. Sackett, Hugo Bezdek.
 Princeton University: J. E. Raycroft, Asa Bushnell.
 Purdue University: N. E. Kizer, A. H. Elward.
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: H. A. Van Velsor.
 Rhode Island State College: M. H. Tyler, F. W. Keaney.
 Rice Institute: H. A. Scott.
 Rutgers College: G. E. Little.
 St. Louis University: C. E. Muellerleile.
 Stanford University: T. A. Storey.
 Stevens Institute of Technology: J. A. Davis, J. C. Sim.
 Susquehanna University: L. D. Grossman.
 Swarthmore College: S. C. Palmer, R. H. Dunn, C. S. Miller, V. Rath.
 Syracuse University: L. A. Bryan.
 Trinity College: R. Oosting.
 Tufts College: C. P. Houston.
 Tulane University: W. C. Smith.
 Union College: G. Daley.
 U. S. Military Academy: Col. R. G. Alexander, Col. C. L. Fenton.
 U. S. Naval Academy: Capt. R. C. Giffin, Lt. Comdr. J. H. Brown;
 Lt. T. J. Hamilton, A. K. Snyder.
 U. S. Coast Guard Academy: Lt. J. S. Merriman, Jr.
 University of Buffalo: C. H. Keene.
 University of Chicago: T. N. Metcalf, D. B. Reed.
 University of Delaware: J. F. Daugherty, G. P. Doherty, Jr.
 University of Georgia: H. J. Stegeman.
 University of Iowa: E. G. Schroeder.
 University of Kansas: J. Naismith.
 University of Maine: T. S. Curtis.
 University of Maryland: H. C. Byrd, C. L. Mackert, H. B. Shipley.
 University of Michigan: F. H. Yost, T. Raphael, L. F. Dow.
 University of Minnesota: B. W. Bierman, F. G. McCormick.
 University of Missouri: C. L. Brewer.
 University of Nebraska: D. X. Bible.
 University of New Hampshire: W. H. Cowell.
 University of North Carolina: R. A. Fetzer.
 University of Notre Dame: J. E. McCarthy.
 University of Pennsylvania: E. L. Mercer, R. T. McKenzie, F. W. Luehring.
 University of Pittsburgh: W. D. Harrison, C. Olson.
 University of Rochester: E. Fauver, W. Campbell, M. D. Lawless, F. T. Gorton.
 University of Southern California: H. C. Willett, W. O. Hunter.
 University of Tennessee: N. W. Dougherty, P. B. Parker.
 University of Tulsa: J. B. Miller.
 University of Vermont: H. A. Prentice, S. C. Abell, J. B. Sabo.
 University of Virginia: C. R. Williams.
 University of Wisconsin: W. E. Meanwell.
 Vanderbilt University: L. C. Glenn, D. McGugin.
 Villanova College: A. G. Severance.
 Washington University: F. H. Ewerhardt, A. E. Eilers.
 Washington and Lee University: R. A. Smith.
 Wesleyan University: F. W. Nicolson, E. Fauver, D. Lash, H. G. McCurdy.

West Chester State Teachers College: G. Killinger.
 Western State Teachers College: J. A. Hyames.
 West Virginia University: C. P. Schott.
 Williams College: C. L. Graham, A. V. Osterhout.
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: P. R. Carpenter.

II. FROM ALLIED MEMBERS:

Midwest Collegiate Conference: H. L. Hart.
 Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Conference: H. H. King.
 Kansas Athletic Conference: A. H. King.
 Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association: J. L. Whitehead.
 Western Conference: O. F. Long.

III. FROM ASSOCIATE MEMBERS:

Andover Academy: O. Tower.

IV. FROM NON-MEMBERS:

American University: W. H. Young.
 Antioch College: M. L. Dawson.
 Baker University: E. S. Liston.
 Berea College: J. W. Armstrong.
 Brooklyn College: F. A. Olesen.
 Colby College: G. F. Loeb, E. W. Millett.
 Colorado College: T. Davies.
 Colorado State College: S. L. Macdonald.
 Holy Cross College: E. N. Anderson, T. J. McCabe.
 Indiana State Teachers College: P. H. Boyts.
 Marshall College: R. M. Hawley.
 North Carolina State College: H. W. Anderson.
 St. Anselm's College: J. F. O'Neil.
 University of Baltimore: B. H. Brown, Jr.
 University of Kentucky: C. A. Wynne.
 University of Montana: B. F. Oakes.
 University of Richmond: G. F. Thistlethwaite.
 Wake Forest College: A. A. Dowlin.
 Western Kentucky State College: C. Anderson.
 National Council Y. M. C. A.: J. Brown, Jr.
 Beverly High School: J. E. Carroll.
 Maine State Department of Education: C. H. Edwards.
 Football Rules Committee: W. S. Langford.
 N. Carolina State Department of Public Instruction: J. McDougald.
 Bensalem Tech. H. S.: G. E. Reimers.
 Football Officials: A. H. Sharpe.
 Horace Mann School: W. F. Tewhill.
 Asbury Park High School: E. M. Wisner.
 Mr. L. W. Allen.
 Dr. J. G. Bliss.

TWENTY-NINTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 27-28, 1934

The Association met in conjunction with the American Football Coaches Association, the College Physical Education Association, and the American Student Health Association, in the Pennsylvania Hotel, New York City.

COUNCIL DINNER

The Council of the N. C. A. A. met Wednesday evening, December 26, at 6:30, and after dinner discussed, along with chairmen of rules committees and representatives of local conferences, various matters concerned with the Convention of the next two days. Details of the business transacted may be found in the N. C. A. A. News Bulletin, Vol. III, No. 1.

ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

On Thursday morning a Round Table Conference on the Recruiting and Subsidizing of College Athletes was held at 10 o'clock. The presiding officer was Professor Z. G. Clevenger, of Indiana University, chairman of a committee appointed by the N. C. A. A. to study the question. A stenographic report of the discussion may be found on pages 101-116 of these Proceedings.

The report of the committee, modified somewhat by the opinions expressed at the Round Table Conference, was presented to the Convention on Friday morning, and unanimously adopted. (See p. 69). For the first time in a national body a code was adopted differentiating between justifiable and unjustifiable methods of recruiting. The N. C. A. A. is not a legislative body, and does not undertake to enforce this code, that being the duty rather of local conferences and associations that may adopt it.

JOINT SESSION

On Thursday afternoon at 2 o'clock a joint session of the four organizations was held, with a large attendance. Addresses were given as follows: For the N. C. A. A., by Robert F. Kelley, Sports Editor of the *New York Times*, on "The Newspaperman and College Sports"; for the Coaches Association, by Dana X. Bible, of the University of Nebraska, on "The Educational Value

of Football"; for the Physical Education Association, by Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, of Columbia College, on "What Should the Physical Education and Athletic Departments contribute to the Education of College Youth?"; and for the Student Health Association, by Dean Fraser Metzger, of Rutgers College, on "The Part Played by the College Physician in an Educational Program."

These papers are printed in full on pp. 80-99 of these Proceedings.

BUSINESS SESSION

The annual business meeting of the N. C. A. A. was held on Friday morning at 10 o'clock, President J. L. Griffith presiding.

After the president made the annual address (see p. 75), a resolution was unanimously adopted instructing the secretary to convey to the two honorary presidents, General Palmer E. Pierce and Professor Charles W. Kennedy, the regrets of the Association at their inability to attend the Convention, and to express to them the continued appreciation of the members of their valuable services to the organization in previous years.

The secretary reported applications for membership from Washburn College, the University of Tulsa, and St. Louis University. They were admitted as members. He reported also that there were now 150 colleges and universities on the roll of members, besides some 50 others that have relations with the N. C. A. A. through membership in local conferences, allied with the national body.

The treasurer reported a balance carried forward to next year of \$5,038.95. His report of receipts and expenses, as reported to the Convention, and audited by Dean S. T. Arnold, of Brown University, was accepted and adopted.

The reports of the vice-presidents of the eight districts were presented in printed form, except that of the seventh district, which was read by the writer, Professor S. L. Macdonald, of Colorado Agricultural College. These reports may be found on pages 19-42.

The reports of the several rules committees were also presented in print, except that of the Football Rules Committee, which was read by the chairman, Mr. Walter Okeson, of Lehigh University. The reports are printed on pages 43-67.

Reports were received from four special committees.

(1) Mr. Frank McCormick reported for the Committee on the Federal Admissions Tax, Professor R. W. Aigler, University of Michigan, chairman, that the committee had made a careful

study of the legal and constitutional side of the question during the two years since they were appointed (at Pasadena in July, 1932) and had sent a representative to Washington to discuss the matter with the proper officials. The formal report of the committee is printed on page 68 of these Proceedings. It was voted to thank the committee for the thorough way in which it has gone into the matter, and to continue it with authority to meet such further situations as may arise in the matter.

(2) Dr. J. E. Raycroft, of Princeton University, reported for the Committee on Relations with Other Amateur Organizations, that our relations with the Amateur Athletic Union and the American Olympic Association were never on a better footing, thanks especially to the tact and wisdom of Dr. C. W. Kennedy, chairman of the committee, and Major Griffith, president of the N. C. A. A.

(3) Professor Z. G. Clevenger reported for the Committee on Recruiting and Subsidizing, recommending the adoption of a code regarding justifiable and unjustifiable methods of recruiting. The report was unanimously accepted and adopted. It may be found on page 69. Professor H. Diederichs, of Cornell University, stated that, while as a member of the committee he had signed the report, he was of the opinion that it should contain an enforcement clause, and that the N. C. A. A. should not continue on its roll of members institutions that did not live up to the code.

(4) For the Committee on the Athletic Eligibility of Students entering from Junior colleges, Dean R. L. Sackett, of Pennsylvania State College, chairman, read a report, printed on pages 71-74, including among other things a definition of a Junior College. The report was accepted and adopted.

Dr. Ewerhardt, of Washington University, gave an urgent invitation to the Association to hold its Convention in 1936 in St. Louis. Dr. W. C. Smith, of Tulane University, also urged upon the delegates the desirability of meeting once again in New Orleans.

The report of the Committee to Nominate Rules Committees for 1935 was presented by the chairman, Professor Thomas E. French, of Ohio State University. The report was accepted and adopted. The committees for the year are listed on pages 3-5.

Mr. Romeyn Berry, chairman of the Committee to Nominate Officers for 1935, reported a list of names, printed on page 2. His report was also accepted and adopted.

The Convention adjourned at 12:30 o'clock.

FRANK W. NICOLSON,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF DISTRICTS

FIRST DISTRICT

DEAN S. T. ARNOLD, BROWN UNIVERSITY

The colleges included in the First District are located in New England and are all members of the Association of New England Colleges for Conference on Athletics. This Association was established over twenty-five years ago, largely through the efforts of Dean Nicolson of Wesleyan and of the late Dean Briggs of Harvard. The Association has served for many years as a clearing house of opinion rather than as a legislative body. In fact in 1928 the Conference voted "That it be the sense of this meeting that it is inexpedient, at the present time, to attempt to form an organization for the government of athletics in the New England colleges". This action emphasizes the fact that there are many points of difference among the colleges represented in this group, but in general all will agree that there is also a solidarity of purpose and aim which is in evidence at all times.

The annual meeting of the Conference has always been held during the month of May. In May 1934 it was voted that the annual meeting should in the future be held on the second Monday in December in order to make it possible to present any material which might be of interest directly to the Council of the National Collegiate Athletic Association at the meeting which precedes the Annual Convention.

The comments from the various colleges indicate that the most important problem that is facing the group at the present time is the financial one. Several colleges report a definite decrease in the number of spectators at practically all inter-collegiate contests. The receipts from football games constitute in the case of most members of this group a large percentage of the income of the year. These receipts have been lower in the fall of 1934 than in the previous years in most colleges. This may have been due in part to the unsatisfactory weather condition which existed on certain week-ends in the season, but the reason seems to be of a more fundamental nature. One athletic director states that decreased gate receipts are due to the development of professional football, and says that in his opinion the professional game will eventually cut down the attendance at college games very materially. Another athletic director states that the decrease in attendance this fall has been caused by a development of interest on the part of members of the community in the race tracks of Rhode Island and New Hampshire. These opinions are undoubtedly sound, but it is probable that the underlying cause is the general financial situation which exists at the present time.

It is a pleasure to report that several colleges have found a

definite growth of interest among the students in the intramural program of recreational sports. A large percentage of the student population is taking part in the program and their interest as spectators is evidently declining. One report states that Rugby football has replaced touch football as an intramural sport, and that it has been found to be much less of a hazard for the competitors. Injuries to students taking part in touch football are reported with disturbing frequency. Two colleges report a decided increase in their athletic facilities. Wesleyan has a remodelled gymnasium, and a new building which contains fourteen squash racquet courts. Amherst has a new building which contains a number of squash racquet courts. Amherst also reports that there will be a development of winter sports.

The report of this district in 1931 contained a statement regarding the player-control system which was tried at Boston University. It has now been found expedient to conform to general practice in coaching and to abandon the player-control system until students and coaches favor it.

There have been no reports of any considerable curtailing of sports during the past year, with the exception of one college. Certain colleges report that students are making sacrifices of one sort or another in order to make it possible to maintain all of the various teams. This would seem to indicate a healthy condition. One athletic director states that all freshman schedules which were curtailed during the past two years have now been reinstated as a result of additional economies and an adjustment of budget.

The following reply to an inquiry regarding problems faced by the college is of interest at this time:

"We, with other colleges who have had unsuccessful football teams judged by the usual standards, are wondering how we can keep our freshmen in college, eligible and playing football, and whether there is some legitimate way by means of which more football men may be induced to select—as an institution of learning without the payment of salaries, variously spoken of as athletic scholarships and student aid."

This statement is undoubtedly overdrawn, but brings up in a very real fashion the problem which is facing many of our colleges.

The soccer football committee of the Association of the New England Colleges for Conference on Athletics reported in part as follows:

"A very definite forward step was made in the development of intercollegiate soccer football during the past year when representatives of ten of the colleges most interested in the sport met in Boston, at the invitation of Mr. Clark of Harvard, and drafted a constitution for a New England Intercollegiate Soccer League.

"The object of this league has been stated as being for the protection of mutual interests of the different universities and colleges represented in it, and the advancement of soccer among its members and the other members of the Intercollegiate Soccer Football Association of America. Membership in this new league is to be limited to universities and colleges in New England of good and regular standing who are active members of the Intercollegiate Soccer Football Association of America, or who, by becoming associate members of the league, indicate their intention of becoming active members of the I. S. F. A. of A. within one year.

"Amherst, Brown, Connecticut, Dartmouth, Harvard, Massachusetts State, Springfield, Tufts, Wesleyan and Williams are the ten colleges which have decided to join the New England Intercollegiate Soccer League, and they will start their competitions this fall. According to the Constitution each college holding membership in the league shall play each year at least one game with not less than three other members of the league."

SECOND DISTRICT

DEAN R. L. SACKETT, PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE

The custom of holding a district meeting of faculty representatives of athletic interests was continued. As it was difficult to find a convenient date for all those who expressed a desire to attend, two meetings were held on March 17, 1934. One was at the University of West Virginia, where eight institutions were represented, and the second was at the Pennsylvania State College, where eight had delegates.

The questions raised were the same—proselyting, recruiting, and subsidizing athletes.

Those at the University of West Virginia felt that there was little or no recruiting or proselyting which was unethical, although all do solicit athletes, either through alumni, friends, or members of athletic committees.

Those who met at Penn State dwelt on unethical activities and those which were appropriate in obtaining athletes. It was generally agreed that "each college could have the kind of athletics and physical education which it desired and that the solution of questions of ethics lies with the institution and cannot be defined by regulations".

It was generally agreed also that when the alumni of an institution are properly informed concerning the ideals and practices of the institution, they support the athletic objectives, with few exceptions.

Should the student transferring from a Junior College and desiring to participate in intercollegiate athletics be required to

obey the transfer rule and remain in residence one year before being eligible? The subject was discussed at length; the practice varies and will be given further study by the N. C. A. A.

Those present desired another district meeting next spring.

Recently, letters were sent to a representative list of large and small colleges and universities in the Second District asking for comments on the present state of intercollegiate athletics.

Without exception, the five who replied stated that in their opinion there was subsidizing, that proof was difficult, that the writer has "general information—specific information in some instances" or that it was rumor or suspicion.

The opinion was offered that there had been a retreat from the attempt to live up to "no subsidizing" which was general a few years ago.

It was the opinion of some that the college was not directly participating but that some outside agency was active. Are the colleges alert to this evil and is every reasonable precaution being taken to spread the serious purpose of the college to eliminate subsidies for athletic ability?

The Pennsylvania College Athletic Eligibility Conference, of which the writer is president, is making a serious attempt to cooperate with the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in carrying out its purposes and in improving intercollegiate relations in athletics.

THIRD DISTRICT

DR. WILBUR C. SMITH, TULANE UNIVERSITY

Football gate receipts were definitely on the increase in the South this year. The game staged a "come back" in fan appeal, as shown at the turnstiles, after several more or less off years during the depression.

Twelve institutions of the twenty-three in the Southern Conference and Southeastern Conference reported increased gate receipts, while six others reported a decrease, and five reported the financial income from the game about the same as last year.

Those where receipts were decreased attributed it largely to the poor showing of their teams during the season.

Fourteen of the institutions reported that the admission price scale to football games was held at the same level as in 1933, five decreased the prices slightly, and four increased prices slightly.

There was virtually no change in the general athletic programs of the various institutions in the district. Most of them maintained relatively the same program in intercollegiate and intramural athletics, although four stated that they had increased the

scope of the work, while five had trimmed the number of minor sports contests in a few branches of athletics.

Answering my query as to whether the members felt that football was being over-emphasized in the Third District, fourteen did not think so, while eight answered affirmatively. The other institution did not give an expression.

Thirteen, however, expressed the belief that there was less subsidizing of athletes now than in 1929, and seven thought there was more subsidization. Most institutions felt the situation on this score about the same as last year.

Fourteen institutions stated that the scholastic marks of student athletes were higher than those of the average student, eight stated the marks were average, and one stated that the marks of their athletes were slightly below the university student average.

I am of the opinion that the high requirements, forcing the student athletes to pass a required number of year and semester hours, is responsible for this highly gratifying report.

Eleven institutions reported that the required work and health education program is being held at the same level, six have decreased this important phase of work, and five have increased it.

Returning to the question of subsidization, my personal opinion is that the institutions should frankly face this eternal problem.

The replies that I have received clearly show that each institution knows that such subsidization exists in some form or another. It seems to me that we would all do well to look upon it from a broad minded view point. A few years back I was bitterly opposed to any form of subsidization. Frankly, my view point has changed.

After all, I wonder if an athlete, who is also a well rounded student, but who is not financially able to defray his expenses through the university, is not entitled to the bare sustenance that would enable him to obtain an education.

Certainly an alumnus, financially able to send this type of boy through the university and interested in the youth and the institution, is really to be given credit for making an education possible for this boy who might otherwise not be able to attend a university.

The boy certainly gives as much time to athletics as the average student who is engaged in outside work to defray his expenses gives to his work. At the same time, this student athlete is forced to maintain high grades, keep in good physical condition, and cannot possibly foolishly spend his time as do so many students who are not engaged in any student activities. The result is the making of a good citizen of this type of man.

Undoubtedly the depression played an important part in halting the so-called subsidization. Many an alumnus, who formerly was financially able to send high school athletes to his alma

mater, today is not in a position to do so. The result in some cases has been good. This may sound like a strange paradox, but doubtless some of the students who were receiving assistance were often "tramp" athletes who were really unworthy and did college athletics only harm.

That is really the greatest evil that we have to face in dealing with subsidization. The "tramp" athlete in the South is now almost an unknown quantity. I speak from what I know to be facts, since a few years ago it was not uncommon to have letters and press clippings from such boys from all over the nation. During the past year or so we received very few such letters. The answer, I believe, is that the boys are no longer sending out these circular letters, "shopping about for the best offer," so to speak, because of the fact that most institutions are not offering scholarships to this nomad type, and the alumni are too intent on recouping their losses to get excited over the clippings that were mailed them.

If an institution has scholarships to offer, it can have no difficulty in finding worthy young men within its own state to assist. By the same token, the student at a great distance, if he is really worthy, should appeal directly to his own nearby institutions for work to assist him, or for a scholarship, if such is offered and he qualifies for it.

After all, no institution should be interested in an applicant for a scholarship unless he merits it. If such applicants are treated otherwise, especially when college athletics enter into it, we are only harming the institution and slowly but surely killing off intercollegiate athletics.

Frankly, I believe the time is at hand when we should hold counsel and recognize this problem with full sincerity. I believe the tendency is in this direction from all sides.

FOURTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR C. L. EDDY, CASE SCHOOL OF APPLIED SCIENCE

During the past year few changes are noted, as far as the activities carried on by the physical education and athletic programs are concerned. There have been certain curtailments in the expense connected with the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, but in the main normal schedules have been maintained, with the possible exception of some of the so-called minor sports. The usual courses in the physical education departments are still being given, but by a reduced staff in some instances. Intramural athletic programs have not only been maintained but, in many schools, have been somewhat expanded.

Since the depression, of course, adjustments have had to be made to meet the requirements forced by a diminished income.

but these adjustments have been largely made previous to the past year. The maintenance of present programs however, due to the financial situation, is a problem of major importance, not only with the athletic departments but with the institutions themselves. Some considerable relief in the way of increased income from football has been experienced both this fall and last, but this has affected the larger institutions much more than the smaller. In fact the attendance at any small school game is adversely affected by a "big" game within a radius of several hundred miles. Also many football enthusiasts prefer to sit at home and listen to the broadcast of the "crucial" games than to attend a local game played by teams from small institutions.

The pressure due to the financial situation certainly has the tendency to make those in charge of athletics in the small college decide that they must do something about it. This may result in their aspiring to get into "big time football", or at least to produce a better brand of football than has been produced in the past, neither of which results can be accomplished without better athletes. Under such conditions the natural result would be an organized effort to attract better athletic material. If to this financial pressure is added the pressure on the coaches from alumni who want a winning team, and there is taken into account in addition the example set by many institutions in their recruiting of students in general, as a guide to the athletic departments, there is presented a combination of circumstances which might readily account for increased activity in the recruiting of athletes, if not their subsidization.

It is argued in many quarters that if giving a scholarship, tuition work, or a job to an athlete is subsidizing, then many institutions are subsidizing a large part of their student bodies, since scholarships and student aid are offered to honor students, orators, musicians, and debaters by college field agents, suggesting the need for the definition of terms and the formulation of a code of accepted practice in the solicitation of students who are athletes.

In order to try and get some expressions as to the effect of the depression upon the athletic situation in general, the following questionnaire was sent to about 50 colleges and universities in this district. About 30 answers were received, which is perhaps about the normal percentage of replies to expect from any kind of a questionnaire. The questions, with the results of the answers, follow:—

One—

During the last few years many of the smaller colleges have had their incomes cut to approximately the tuition paid by the students. This has led to rather keen competition for students in general, resulting in some instances to undignified, if not questionable, practices.

Has this situation affected in any way the recruiting of athletes? If so, in what way?

The answers to this question were about equally divided between "yes" and "no". A large majority of those answering "yes" were of the opinion that the recruiting of athletes had been much more active during the past year. One remark was to the effect that the practice of recruiting athletes had become so general that it was the accepted practice, both with the larger as well as with the smaller schools. It is to be noted that this question does not contemplate the *subsidizing* of athletes but only the solicitation or *recruiting* of athletes, but it may be inferred from some of the answers that the two terms might, in the minds of some, have the same meaning.

Two—

The financial situation has affected adversely practically all colleges and universities.

In your intercollegiate games, is there any disposition to schedule "money games" with a view of adding to the income of the institution, rather than to schedule games with institutions which have the same standards of sportsmanship and scholarship?

A majority answering this question admitted that there was a tendency to schedule at least some games because of the "gate" they would attract, this being a necessary procedure in order to meet the financial demands upon the management. However, such games were with institutions having the same standards of eligibility and scholarship. Some complained that they had difficulty in getting schedules in their own Conference because they did not furnish sufficient drawing power, and that therefore most all schedules were made from the "money" viewpoint. One remarked that this situation had always existed, but that it was getting worse every year.

Three—

Many small colleges apparently have stronger football teams this year than usual, due probably to better material.

If this condition exists, what are the influences which might account for it?

Practically all who answered this question accepted as true the statement preceding the question, but most of them think that the growth in strength has been going on for several years, and that it is due to better coaching in the high schools, thus producing more well trained athletes for the colleges. Other reasons advanced to account for the situation are: No jobs, so athletes go to college for expenses; F. E. R. A. help; expenses

less in a small college; getting more help; can't afford to leave home; more recruiting and subsidizing; players prefer to go to school where they can play; more help given to athletes that formerly went to other students; combing high schools for athletes, offering subsidies to some, and laxity on entrance requirements.

Four—

The financial pressure, with its resulting "survival" complex, has been great with the management of the small colleges' athletic departments during the past few years.

If this situation has resulted in the lowering of standards as regards recruiting and subsidizing athletes, what measures can be taken to correct it?

About 25% of those returning the questionnaire gave no answer to this question; about the same number said "I do not know"; while the remaining 50% were slightly in favor of the idea that the financial pressure had not lowered the standards as regards recruiting of athletes.

The only measures suggested to correct the situation were either to drop those colleges which resort to subsidizing from the Conference to which they belong, or to make the N. C. A. A. a legislative body and deny membership to any institution not conforming to the rules established by that body.

Five—

The newspapers have given considerable publicity to student betting on football games this year, especially through football pools.

Has betting been more prevalent this year than usual? Have the players participated in pools? What are your reactions to the practice?

A majority of answers to this question indicated that betting on games was no more prevalent than usual this year, but that betting through the pools was the prevailing method—especially at the beginning of the season. This form of betting, however, had been quite effectively stopped by the "welshing" on the part of some of the concerns operating the pools. Practically all were of the opinion that betting on games was prevalent enough to warrant some action to stop it, but no suggestions were made as to how this could be accomplished.

Six—

Are there any other features connected with the conduct of athletics which you care to discuss?

Comparatively few had any special features connected with the conduct of athletics which they cared to discuss. The subject mentioned most often was that of the decided increase in drink-

ing by the spectators at football games. This seemed to be considerably more of a problem for the larger schools than for the smaller, and apparently is serious enough to warrant careful consideration in an effort to find a solution.

Conclusions—

From the standpoint of extent of program carried on and of the income derived from admission to games, it appears that there has been no decrease during the past year, and in many instances there has been a decided increase.

There is no evidence of any decided moral uplift in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, but there is some evidence that the moral plane has been lowered. While the competition for students in general is keen among certain schools, it is decidedly more so when it comes to an outstanding athlete, for the reason that while all institutions may not want additional students, few of them do not desire good athletes, and they are soliciting them. There appears to be no evidence to support the statement made by one athletic official that the financial situation had stopped all subsidizing. The problem of subsidizing is still with us and remains to be solved. The situation in this respect is claimed by several to be worse than any time since the publication of the Carnegie Foundation Report No. 23; that there may have been a change in the methods employed, but that no change in the results has been accomplished.

While the law of "supply and demand" may account for the small colleges getting better athletic material, hence having better teams and thus raising the quality of their performances, it does not necessarily follow that more "winning" teams are produced or that competition for athletes will be less active. On the contrary, the competition is apt to be more keen, giving rise to many misunderstandings among colleges as to methods employed to attract athletic material. The adoption by the N. C. A. A. of a code of accepted practice covering the solicitation of athletes, while it will not stop cheating, will do much to clarify the situation by regularizing some present practices and condemning others.

FIFTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR C. L. BREWER, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

The Fifth District of the Association includes a tremendous territory, 800 miles from east to west and a similar distance from north to south. The states included are Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Within this area there are 85 colleges, and 16 governing conferences of important rank. The report from the many institu-

tions and the several conferences indicates that athletics in the past year have been on a more satisfactory basis, considering participation in the sports, and in general student, alumni, and public interest, than for several years. There was a decided increase in attendance at football games this fall, which indicates, probably, a more wholesome and general interest of alumni and public.

Your representative called a district meeting on December 7 and 8th in Kansas City, which was well attended and most interesting. Some 52 colleges of the district sent representatives and 11 conferences were represented. An informal round-table discussion was held on Friday evening, December 7, with a formal program the forenoon of December 8, and a basketball rules interpretation meeting the afternoon of the 8th. Most of the problems of the district and of intercollegiate athletics in general were brought up for discussion. Those which aroused the most interest and discussion were:

(1) *Broadcasting.*

The opinion on broadcasting was divided. Many of the leading institutions are not broadcasting any athletic events and believe that policy to be a wise one. Many others, especially the state institutions, feel there is a certain obligation to alumni, friends, and the public, and have indicated they wish to continue to broadcast important games and events. In an informal vote of the representatives present there was an even division of opinion.

(2) *Training Table.*

There has been a growing indication in this district that some form of training table to meet emergencies of late practice hours and other institutional problems is advisable. Those present at the meeting were evenly divided on this question, yet in the business meetings following all of the larger conferences voted to retain the present rule which prohibits the training table.

(3) *The Junior College.*

In the past few years there has been established in the district a large number of Junior colleges. This movement has brought up a new problem in the matter of years of competition permitted. The Junior colleges were represented on the program and presented a plea to permit graduates of Junior colleges on entering Senior colleges to be immediately eligible for competition. It was indicated that this was fair to the boys and permitted a normal program in athletics corresponding to the program in education. This question presented so many problems, however, that the two major conferences, the Big Six and the Missouri Valley, voted not to count the first year of Junior college competition, but to still hold to the one year residence for transfers.

(4) *State High School Athletic Associations.*

The state high school athletic associations were represented at the meeting by their secretaries and one of their number appeared on the program. He presented to the conference a plea for a better understanding of the needs of high school boys competing in athletics, and the great need of adjusted playing rules for these adolescent and early age boys. These high school representatives clearly indicated that, unless the rules committees of the N. C. A. A. fully recognized this need, the high school associations must, in justice to their own boys, establish a set of rules fitted to the secondary school age.

(5) *Amateurism and Recruiting.*

Dean T. H. Thompson, chairman of the Faculty athletic committee of the University of Nebraska, presented some splendid statements on these questions. I quote a few. "We ought to take pride in the situation in this mid-central territory. Amateurism is exemplified better in this region, including the Big Ten Conference, than anywhere else in the country" . . . "On recruiting the coach should have the same ethical standards as the doctor, dentist, or lawyer. Neither should go out and solicit patients or players, but both should feel it a duty and a privilege to consult with their charges—when they come to them." On subsidizing Dean Thompson definitely says paying money to a student because of his athletic promise on a basis not open to other students is subsidization. Dean Thompson also suggested to the advisers and coaches of college football players that they do something about the players who considered professional football as a career. "The thing that worries me," he said, "is that the boys who consider professional football do not realize that the career usually ends when they are 30 years old, and then most of them are unfitted for anything else when other men are just beginning to achieve. Players should think beyond this time," he recommended.

On the whole, athletics in the district seem to be well organized and efficiently administered. More than 90% of the colleges are members of some holding group or conference. Of this 90%, all have very positive institutional and faculty control. All of the larger institutions require one year of residence before participation. The limitation of a total of three years exists throughout the conference except in the smaller institutions, where freshmen may play and where four years in all is permitted. In every case of such colleges, however, a transfer from one institution to another must be in attendance either one semester or one year before being permitted to play. The most satisfying condition in the district is: (a) The few examples of institutions not belonging to some governing group. (b) The fine relationship between the Junior colleges, the high school associations,

and the several college and university organizations. In these relationships I believe the colleges of the district are generally furnishing effective and stimulating leadership. (c) The almost unanimous belief in, and existence of, actual institutional responsibility and control.

At the conclusion of the district meeting in Kansas City the delegates and representatives present voted unanimously to hold similar meetings each year early in December. It is hoped that at these district meetings there can be presented each year approximately the same program and problems as will be considered at the general meeting of the Association.

SIXTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR D. A. PENICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Meeting of Representatives of the Sixth District of the N.C.A.A.

As was reported a year ago, a meeting was held in Dallas for all men interested in intercollegiate athletics in the colleges of this district. A full report of that meeting was given at the Association meeting a year ago and was incorporated in the Proceedings. Another meeting was held this year at the Baker Hotel, Dallas, Texas, December 14, at 7:30 p. m. A program was carefully prepared in advance and was carried out as far as it was possible. Some of the speakers who had been invited were unable to attend for various good and sufficient reasons. In spite of the absence of some, several interesting addresses were made and there was a good deal of spirited discussion of the problems suggested.

Professor E. W. McDiarmid, Vice-president of the Southwest Conference and athletic representative from Texas Christian University, sounded the optimistic note of athletic conditions in his Conference. He has always been a strong believer in the highest values of intercollegiate athletics, and presented the matter in a most convincing way. Mr. McDiarmid had prepared his paper very carefully and made as strong a plea for intercollegiate athletics as I have ever heard. It is hoped that the paper will be published.

The problem of athletic control was discussed by Mr. Beauford Jester, Chairman of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas, with especial emphasis upon the relation of boards of trustees to athletic control in their respective institutions. That, of course, is a big problem involving the whole question of faculty control. Is the athletics of an institution to be guided by a faculty to which has been delegated such control by the board of trustees, or should the board itself and the president of the institution take over the management of athletics? Mr. Jester

thought that the problem of athletic control should be delegated to a committee of the faculty with the board of trustees of the institution as a court of final resort.

The problem of intercollegiate athletics in institutions financially embarrassed was presented by Professor J. W. Pender of the North Texas State Teachers College. It is probably true all over the country that many schools are making a desperate effort to maintain an athletic program in intercollegiate competition when they should be confining their efforts to physical training or intramural athletics for the entire student body because they have not the funds for a larger program. In many cases in this district intercollegiate programs are being maintained by schools which are not paying the salaries of their teaching staff. One is forced to conclude that this practice continues because of competition and for advertising purposes. Professor Pender urged strict economy on the part of institutions financially embarrassed.

Professor Harry Scott, of Rice Institute, who is at the head of the Physical Education Department at Rice, discussed the relation of physical education to intercollegiate athletics. Certainly there should be a close alliance between the two, and it is natural to expect that athletes will be interested in physical education for the preparation which they find there in continuing in the field of athletics after college days are over, especially in the teaching field. Professor Scott felt that physical education should be the nucleus around which all forms of athletics should be built.

Professor J. C. Godbey, President of the Texas Conference, spoke with much emphasis on the question of Junior college transfers. Most conferences in this district allow Junior college graduates to become immediately eligible in Senior colleges. In some conferences their eligibility is limited to two years, and the Junior college athlete has the alternative of taking his year of residence as a non-participant and then having three years of competition in the Senior college if he elects to remain in the institution that long. There is much competition among the institutions of this district in securing attendance of these Junior college graduates, many of whom are outstanding athletes. The present plan helps the Junior colleges to keep their students through two full years and thereby has distinct merits. Whether the Senior conferences will continue this practice is still an open question. Professor Godbey gave an excellent historical picture of the rapid growth of Junior colleges and urged that a careful study be made of the relationship between Junior and Senior colleges which is becoming more and more a problem.

Mr. Jimmie Kitts, football and basketball coach at Rice Institute, told the group how to build a winning football team. He was selected for this task because of his success in leading Rice Institute to a football championship this year, the first time in

its history. He has also won his spurs in interscholastic coaching circles by coaching winning basketball teams to a championship several times.

The very large problem of recruiting and subsidizing was assigned to Mr. H. J. L. Stark, another member of the Board of Regents of the University, formerly Chairman of the Board. He has always taken a keen interest in athletics, and in his student days was manager of the baseball team. Mr. Stark feels very strongly that it is impossible to enforce regulations against recruiting and subsidizing, and believes that it is better for the general morale of the students to remove from the statute books all regulations which cannot be enforced. He urges a high standard of scholarship and believes strongly in the restricting and restraining regulations of the conferences where it is possible to enforce them. His presentation of the subject was most interesting and provoked a lot of discussion.

Professor C. C. Selecman, of Southern Methodist University, spoke a few minutes on the part which a college president has in the control of intercollegiate athletics. His advice was that probably the best thing a president can do is to get out of the way of the athletic committee of the faculty.

It is hoped that programs of this nature will be instrumental in raising the standard of intercollegiate athletics in the Sixth District. Certainly it gives an opportunity for an exchange of opinion between all classes of people in our institutions who are at all interested in the problems. At this meeting were present 6 presidents, 8 deans, 20 faculty representatives, 12 directors or managers, 5 coaches; total number present, 65.

A Successful Football Season

The Southwest Conference had its most successful football season in history. The Conference teams were well balanced and the championship was not finally decided until the last game between Rice and Baylor University was played. Rice won the championship with a percentage of .833, followed by the University of Texas .750, Southern Methodist University .583, Texas Christian University .500, University of Arkansas .417, Texas A. & M. .250, Baylor University .167. Full season standing, including all games played, was Rice .900, University of Texas and Southern Methodist University .800 each, Texas Christian University .667, Arkansas .500, Baylor .300, A. & M. .222.

The most gratifying feature of the season was the success which the teams of the Southwest had in intersectional contests. Rice Institute defeated Purdue 14-0, Creighton 47-13, and tied Louisiana State University 9-9. The University of Texas defeated Notre Dame 7-6 and Oklahoma University 19-0. Southern

Methodist University defeated Fordham 26-13, tied Louisiana State 14-14, beat Oklahoma A. & M. 41-0, and won from Washington University 7-0. Texas Christian University defeated Tulsa 14-12, Loyola of New Orleans 7-0, and Santa Clara 9-7.

Players from the Southwest have received national recognition as never before. For the first time in history the Associated Press ranked two men from this Conference in the first team of the country—Bill Wallace of Rice and Darrel Lester of Texas Christian University. The United Press named on its All-American team Robert Wilson and Clyde Carter of Southern Methodist University. Bohn Hilliard of the University of Texas was placed on the second team of the NEA feature Service, and was invited, along with Clyde Carter and Roy Fuqua of Southern Methodist University, to participate in the East-West match on the Coast. Many other outstanding athletes of the Southwest Conference were named on various second teams or received honorable mention. It was truly a great year for football in that Conference. The attendance also was an improvement over the attendance of the last few years, unfortunately with a consequent increase in excitement and undue agitation and publicity.

The Problem of Broadcasting

There has been a definite understanding between the Conference and the broadcasting companies over a period of two years. The companies in Texas have cheerfully cooperated with the Conference to the extent of announcing games a week in advance at recurring periods and have consistently urged all listeners to attend all games. They have also refrained from announcing the broadcasting until noon of the day of the game. Some of the Conference members feel that this cooperation has increased the attendance. Others feel that broadcasting is a cause of loss financially to the schools of the Conference, unless it is possible for the Conference to secure a sponsor and sell the broadcasting privileges.

Of course, if the schools are playing football for financial reasons, it behooves them to make such arrangements as will result in bringing in as large an income as possible and in checking any program that interferes with that income. On the other hand, if the schools refuse to allow broadcasting, they are arousing antagonism among the public at large and especially among their own ex-students who find it impossible, at times, to attend the games. The solution seems to be to enter into some arrangements with the broadcasting companies by which the companies and the schools can share in the income from the sponsors. That matter is being studied in this district by a committee of the Southwest Conference.

Talks Over Radios

The President of the Southwest Conference, who, for several years, has been Vice-president of the N. C. A. A., was called on to make a series of talks on intercollegiate athletics over the network of the Southwest Broadcasting Company. The first talk was on the history or development of athletics in the United States; the second was on the value of intercollegiate athletics; and the third on the problems of intercollegiate athletics. It is hoped that these talks will have some value in bringing to the attention of the general public the difficulties in handling the whole problem of intercollegiate athletics.

Athletic Control

This very important subject was discussed, as indicated in the first part of this report, by the Chairman of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas. It seems to be an admitted fact that control has largely passed from our faculties into the hands of boards of trustees, largely on the ground that the board of trustees is, in the final analysis, responsible for the control of the institution in all its phases. That position, of course, is entirely tenable and it presents a very serious situation. For the most part the board of trustees is in closer contact with the public and its demands and, therefore, is more apt to yield to public clamor than the faculty, and I for one regret that there is a marked tendency to transfer control of intercollegiate athletics from our faculties to any other group.

Recruiting and Subsidizing

There seems to be no solution for this problem. The two things go hand in hand. A report is being made to the N. C. A. A. at this meeting by a committee appointed a year ago. As a member of that committee I feel strongly that, unless something can be done to curb this practice, intercollegiate athletics as an amateur proposition is doomed. Many conferences have good regulations but seem to be unable to enforce them. As indicated above, there is a feeling among many people that we should dispense with regulations that we cannot enforce. I submit, as I did a year ago at the round-table discussion in Chicago, that the solution of the problem depends upon the integrity of the coaches and the integrity of the schools. If these two groups can get together on a program of tenure of office for the coach, win or lose, the problem will solve itself. On the other hand, if the school insists on a winning football team at any cost it can not expect the coach to refrain from doing everything in his power to get the material to win the game. In the last analysis, responsibility lies with the school. Any school knows whether its coach is recruiting and subsidizing,

and if in the face of such knowledge it refuses to discipline its coach, it should be expelled from the conference of which it is a member. If it has not a coach which will cooperate with it in such a program it should get one that will.

As far as the Sixth District is concerned, this problem of recruiting and subsidizing is a real one, but, relatively speaking, we are not able to recruit and subsidize enough to keep our athletes from scattering all over the United States, into the south and middle-west and the Pacific coast where they seem to be able to get better propositions than we can offer them.

It appears to me that all of us must make a determined effort to create the right sentiment in the minds of the public at large. I believe that we can, in making this attempt, secure the cooperation of the broadcasting companies and the sports editors. The talks that I made this fall were at the request of the broadcasting company, and I feel sure that they would cooperate with all of our schools in a program of creating public sentiment in regard to these problems in intercollegiate athletics. The sports editors are the first ones to know what is going on among the players, the coaches, and all others interested in football and other sports. If by appealing to them we can secure their assistance to the extent of putting the right authorities in touch with bad situations, at least an attempt can be made to prevent violations before they transpire. I have talked with some of these sports editors and find them quite sympathetic and ready to help.

At any event something must be done through the integrity of the institutions and the conferences to which they belong to preserve the integrity of the boy and keep him from becoming callous and deceptive and dishonest in trying to reach ends which he feels that he cannot reach in any other way. I have suggested in other relations and would like to suggest here that the only way to accomplish this end is to be open and aboveboard in all our transactions. This may be a very difficult task, but at least we should set ourselves to it.

One plan that has been suggested many times is to dispense with regulations concerning recruiting and subsidizing, as was suggested above, and open the gates wide. That at least would be honest. It may be assumed that recruiting without subsidization is right. If that can be assumed, and if we still wish to have rules against subsidization, let every school be required to publish a list of its contestants, with a complete statement of the funds used by each contestant for his expenses in college. This public accounting would, at least, have the value of honesty. If it were found that any athlete or school did not give a true accounting, the athlete could be permanently disqualified or the school could be suspended or expelled from the conference of which it was a member. If these suggestions are too Utopian or impossible of realization, let us find some other, because we must do something if we wish to save amateur athletics.

Sportsmanship

While the sportsmanship of the Southwest is of a very high order, there have been instances of breaking-over during the season just closed. Two schools in the Southwest Conference were forced to discipline an athlete. The officials of the district protested to the Conference and the Conference passed a very rigid regulation. Hereafter any player who is guilty of striking, or attempting to strike or use any other form of violence toward an official will be permanently disqualified from participating in the Conference. Likewise any coach who is guilty of any similar action must be removed from the employ of the institution to which he belongs, and the institution which refuses to dismiss such a coach will be dropped from the Conference.

Officials

The selection of officials in this district has not been entirely satisfactory. At least one conference has decided, by way of experiment for a year, to have its officials selected by a committee consisting of the president of the Conference, the president of the Directors' Association, and the president of the Officials' Association.

Employment

It is legitimate in the Conference of the Sixth District for athletes to hold jobs for which they are paid the regular stipend, to hold scholarships for which they may be scholastically eligible, and to secure loans which are authorized by the institution concerned. An attempt is made to check on these matters by requiring the institution in at least one conference to report on such items to the president of the conference in the case of every participating athlete and also members of freshman squads. This practice is recommended to other conferences and institutions throughout the nation.

The writer wishes to express his appreciation for the friendship which he has formed over the years in the Association with the men who have been leading in the solution of intercollegiate athletic problems and to say how much he regrets withdrawal from active participation in such matters. He feels that the pressure of other duties cannot longer be allowed to go unheeded. He also feels that he has contributed to the cause all that he can and should turn over to others the privilege of carrying on. In retiring he wishes for each and every one more and more success in accomplishing the high aims of the idealist in the athletic program. Those who do not have such aims, if there be any, he hopes will retire from any athletic associations.

SEVENTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR S. L. MACDONALD, COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

The Seventh District includes the states of Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. This domain embraces about 18% of the area of the 48 states, and about 2.2% of the population. There are in the district about 28 institutions of college rank, enrollments in which for the school year vary from a minimum of a few hundred to a maximum of about 3600. The Universities of Colorado and Utah have each about the latter number, and the University of Denver only slightly less. There are also in the district 11 Junior colleges.

Several athletic conferences are operating in the district. The Rocky Mountain Conference covers the states of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, and includes Montana State College. The differences of a year ago which for a time divided this group of 12 schools into two groups of 8 and 4 respectively have been composed sufficiently to permit them to go on again as a group of 12. Montana University is the only school in the district belonging to the Pacific Coast Conference. New Mexico State College and State University belong to the Border Conference, whose four other members are in the Sixth District. The Montana Intercollegiate Conference was organized Nov. 20, 1934, at Helena, and seems to cover the field in that state for those schools not associated with the Pacific Coast or Rocky Mountain Conference. The rules of the Montana group are not finally ratified, but will be similar to those of conferences generally, except that freshmen will be eligible. The New Mexico Intercollegiate Conference is just now in process of organization. Of the eleven Junior colleges in the district the five which are in Utah have formed the Intermountain Junior College Athletic Association. It thus appears that practically all schools of this district of collegiate rank now have a conference relationship. There are five Junior colleges still without league or conference relations, and, due to their isolation, they will probably not have such relationship in the near future.

In the 20 reporting of the total 28 higher institutions, there are at the present time about 370 graduates and transfers from Junior colleges. The majority are graduates.

The Junior college problem is new with us, and is rapidly assuming larger proportions. Its growing importance caused the Rocky Mountain Conference at its last meeting to give it more serious attention and to pass the proviso that graduates of these schools upon entering conference institutions may continue uninterrupted their competition in athletics, subject only to the limits of total participation. The Border Conference has a somewhat similar rule. Both the Rocky Mountain and Border Conferences have now adopted the freshman rule for all sports

and each of these two conferences now employs a commissioner. These are probably the most noteworthy advances of the past year.

Public interest in football seems to have a little more than held its own during the past season. Nine schools report increased attendance over former years, six report a decrease, three report no change. The three outstanding stadia of the region are at Colorado University, Utah University, and Denver University. Total attendance increased at Colorado and Utah, but showed a decrease at Denver. The largest attendance for a single contest was the Thanksgiving day game between Colorado University and Denver University at Denver. The paid admissions numbered 21,853. It has been the tendency for some years for games of major interest to draw increasingly larger crowds, while the opposite is true for games of minor interest.

Prices of admission to athletic contests are reported as not changing in 13 schools, as reduced in three, and as advanced in one. The whole athletic program is financially self-supporting or operating at a profit in 13 schools, at a deficit in six. Eleven report football as the most profitable, six report basketball.

This district reports very little material outlay for stadia or field improvements and the like during the past year. Grandstands and tracks have been improved at 4 campuses under the F.E.R.A. and C.W.A., with a cash expenditure for material of not more than a few hundred dollars in each case. One of the smaller schools reports investing \$6000.00 in a gymnasium.

The intramural athletic program is financed in a few schools by football. The program is holding its own or increasing in all institutions of the district. Increasing responsibility seems to be felt in nearly all schools for the general health of the student. Thirteen schools report retaining physicians on part or full time, nurses are employed in eight schools, and hospitalization privileges are furnished with certain limitations in five schools.

The matter of the recruiting of athletes continues as an aggravating issue in intercollegiate athletics. Of 18 schools reporting it is expressed as a belief that the recruiting practice is becoming worse by five, becoming better by seven, not improving by two, while six aver that they are innocent. Montana University reports that the "practice is increasing, due to more liberal rules made by the Pacific Coast Conference." A rather discouraging feature of the situation at present is that there is developing on several campuses the feeling that the usually accepted standards are too highly idealistic to admit of satisfactory enforcement. Four schools so report, while sixteen report to the contrary.

So called "pep" meetings are reported to be holding their own in seven schools, two report them to be increasing in popularity, while seven report them waning or discontinued. Personal

leadership seems responsible for their perpetuation, including some degree of sponsorship or direction by the faculty. From one of the largest schools word comes that soon after the opening in September a series of student evening meetings are planned at which proper school spirit is inculcated. It is a sort of school to teach songs and yells, to outline parades and marches, and to prepare for manoeuvres at the half at football games. The idea is said to have worked quite successfully for the past football season.

The general decorum of the sidelines and the grandstands is reported as satisfactory or improved at the 18 campuses which responded to the inquiry. The hostile attitude of the crowd, more characteristic of basketball, sometimes attaining almost the fury of a mob, is becoming less frequent. For several years a football coach in a town of 12,000 has met a volunteer group of citizens at a mid-day Monday luncheon. These affairs are well attended, frequently numbering more than a hundred. His talks to these "drugstore quarterbacks" through the football season are usually rather technical, and relate to the game of the previous Saturday. But the meetings have no doubt materially helped in bringing about a better understanding and a more human relationship between the game and the community. This elevating influence is being recognized by other communities and by the press in a state-wide way.

EIGHTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR H. C. WILLETT, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

In the Eighth District there are thirty-seven colleges and universities maintaining intercollegiate athletic programs. These institutions are spread over five states, in a territory that extends from Mexico to Canada and from the Pacific coast inland across two states. It is obviously impossible for any one person to have first-hand knowledge of conditions throughout such an extensive area. Consequently, the time honored device of a questionnaire was used to furnish the basis for this report, with the remarkable result that one hundred per cent of the thirty-seven institutions promptly and graciously furnished answers to pertinent questions regarding the condition of athletics in their respective communities.

It is not appropriate in this report to present a detailed analysis of the information supplied by these questionnaires. It will be sufficient to draw a brief word picture of conditions in intercollegiate and intramural athletics, relying on the questionnaires themselves to verify the details of the picture, if indeed verification is required or desired.

The period of curtailment of intercollegiate and intramural athletic programs is at an end in the Eighth District. Numerous instances of the addition of new sports, or the reinstatement of sports temporarily dropped because of financial difficulties are reported. Of special interest, perhaps, is the adoption of Rugby football as an intercollegiate spring sport by four of the California universities. A Rugby league of these universities has been formed, intercollegiate contests scheduled, and arrangements made for international matches with some of the strong teams of Western Canada.

Intramural athletics are being maintained on the standards of previous years, with many institutions definitely planning the expansion of their programs as soon as financial conditions permit. The institutions in the district report unanimously that college authorities definitely encourage and support their intramural athletics. Faculties are, in general, favorable or at least tolerant in their attitudes towards athletics, both intercollegiate and intramural.

The financial condition of athletics shows some promise of improvement over last year. With three exceptions, the reporting institutions are taking in larger gate receipts from football than in 1933. At a substantial majority of the colleges football will pay its own way, and in most of these cases will help finance other sports. But lest the picture appear too rosy, let it be recorded that only four institutions in the entire district expect the receipts from athletic contests to equal or exceed athletic expenditures. The large majority will find it necessary to supplement gate receipts by fees assessed on students for the support of extracurricular activities.

Attendance at home football games was larger this year. Ticket prices on the average were a bit lower than in 1933.

There were exceptions, of course, to the general statements given above. There are five institutions reporting smaller receipts from football than last year, but two of these five are large universities which have enjoyed unusually profitable seasons in recent years. Both report that athletic income this year will be sufficient to cover the cost of their entire athletic programs. These two institutions are also found among the total of three reporting a decreased attendance at football games.

At the time this report is compiled, the Eighth District is divided on whether to broadcast or not to broadcast football games. A bare majority of the institutions believe that their income from football is less because of radio broadcasting; the rest either believe that their income is not less, or admit no definite opinion on the matter. About a third of the institutions would vote to abolish all broadcasting, if given the opportunity; nearly half would vote not to abolish, and the rest are not sure what they would do if faced with the necessity of voting. On

one matter the large majority is unanimous, and that is that they have no solution to offer for the radio problem.

The representatives of the reporting institutions were invited to list what they believed to be the major problems confronting intercollegiate athletics at the present time. A total of nearly seventy problems were listed. To be sure, these were not all unrelated and not all universal. Problems related to finances appear with greatest frequency, closely followed in order by problems connected with the recruiting of athletes and the "deflating" of athletics. Space does not permit the listing of all the problems which disturb the representatives of the Eighth District. If listed, they would probably only duplicate the problems in every district.

Turning from the field of intercollegiate athletics, the rise of organized professional football on the Pacific Coast calls for a word of comment. Heretofore professional football in the district has been of the sporadic, hit or miss, type. Two professional leagues have now been formed, one centered in the San Francisco Bay district and the other in Los Angeles. Games are played on Sunday afternoons. A low admission price attracts many, the peak attendance in Los Angeles being in the neighborhood of eighteen thousand on one Sunday. Color is given to each team by recruiting it largely from players recently connected with some particular local college. The name of each team indicates the former college connection of the majority of its players. Thus it is not hard for the local fan to associate the "Braves", or the "Cubs", or the "Maroons", or the "Shamrocks" with certain California universities or colleges. Old college rivalries are thus capitalized. The members of the winning and losing teams share and share alike in the gate receipts. It is reported on good authority that the maximum amount received by any one player for any one game during the season to date was seventy-seven dollars, and the minimum somewhat less than ten dollars. What effect this venture in professional football will have on the intercollegiate game in California remains to be seen.

On the whole, athletics in the Eighth District are in good condition. There is a feeling of optimism amongst the colleges, and a growing hope that the days of greatest trial are in the past.

REPORTS OF RULES COMMITTEES

ASSOCIATION FOOTBALL (SOCCER)

Interest in college soccer showed a notable increase during the past season. The success of the Middle Atlantic League, now in its third year of operation, was so marked that it encouraged the formation of the New England League, which operated this fall for the first time. It is hoped that similar sectional leagues will be formed in various parts of the country.

The Association Football Rules Committee met in New York on Saturday, January 17, 1934. There were present Mr. A. W. Marsh of Amherst, Mr. Douglas Stewart of the University of Pennsylvania, Lieutenant Commander W. W. Feineman of the U. S. Naval Academy, and Mr. Henry W. Clark, Chairman of the Committee. In addition, Mr. Neil M. Fleming, Pennsylvania State, of the Advisory Committee, Mr. Morris W. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer of the Intercollegiate Association, and Mr. John Doyle of the American Sports Publishing Company were in attendance at part or all the meeting.

On the suggestion of your committee, the Intercollegiate Association appointed a Rules Committee to meet with the N. C. A. A. Committee in future years so that action on the rules would be more uniform. It is felt that this is the most significant step governing college soccer rules that has been taken in years. Hitherto, the Intercollegiate Association has thrown open a discussion of rules changes to the meeting as a whole, which is too large and uninstructed to act intelligently on such questions. In addition, the N. C. A. A. Rules Committee has acted independently of the Intercollegiate Association. By this action, the two bodies will act in concert and develop intercollegiate soccer as an entity.

The N. C. A. A. Rules Book is now the sole publication for college soccer rules in the country. It is issued early enough to secure proper circulation before the soccer season, and the receipts to the N. C. A. A. from the sale of this book are mounting steadily.

The rules changes discussed at the meeting were as follows:

The limit of five substitutions was left unchanged for another year, but the limit of one resubstitution was changed to three. The general sentiment of the Committee is toward more liberal substitutions.

It was voted to have the managers keep the time of games with stop watches rather than to entrust this important duty to referees with ordinary watches.

The Committee adopted the following vote, "Coaching from the sidelines during the progress of the game is not permitted."

There was considerable discussion in regard to injuries suffered by goal keepers during the 1933 season, as a result of which the following action was taken, "The Committee, mindful of injuries suffered by goal keepers during the past season, urged that referees penalize severely any rules infractions involving the protection of the goal keeper."

The Committee also asked colleges to experiment with the following suggestion: "The goal keeper may, within his own penalty area, use his hands but only to fist or deflect the ball. He may not catch, carry, or throw the ball. The goal keeper may not be charged within the goal area except when he is obstructing an opponent."

This year, for the first time, the Committee is asking for suggestions as to the rules from the colleges playing soccer.

HENRY W. CLARK,
Chairman

BASKETBALL

Your Basketball Committee met in joint session with representatives of other constituent bodies at the annual meeting April 14 and 15.

The National Basketball Committee of the United States and Canada is composed of representatives from the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, the Young Men's Christian Association, and the Canadian Amateur Basketball Association. The basketball rules formulated by this body for 1934-35 contain very few changes from the former year. It is to be hoped that the game is gradually reaching a stable and standardized condition.

The game of basketball always will present a good many problems in sportsmanship for both players and spectators. This element probably needs more attention at the present time than any other. Administrators, coaches, and officials, anxious to see basketball continue its development as a popular and valuable game, should unite in a vigorous effort to see standards of sportsmanship materially improved.

Basketball has been placed on the Olympic program for 1936. This is significant of the growth of basketball as an international sport. Credit for the rapid spread of basketball as an international game belongs largely to the International Y. M. C. A. Dr. John Brown, Jr. and his associates have had much to do with the introduction of basketball in many countries. This is all quite appropriate, especially since Dr. Naismith originated the game of basketball at the Y. M. C. A. College, in Springfield, Massachusetts.

Professor Elmer Berry, of the Y. M. C. A. College, has been working for a number of years for the Olympic recognition of basketball. Dr. Forrest C. Allen, representing the National Basketball Coaches' Association, also has been working for the past six years on the problem of securing Olympic recognition for basketball. The efforts of these men have been successful and now basketball has been recognized as an Olympic sport for the games in Berlin in 1936.

With the large number of basketball teams in the United States, a difficult problem is presented to select an appropriate representative for the United States in the Olympic Games.

While it has been most pleasing to see the development of basketball as a popular intercollegiate sport, it has seemed to your chairman that basketball did not lend itself very happily to Olympic competition. However, it is hoped that the various problems presented may be handled in a satisfactory manner. It seems fair to state that the game of basketball in the United States and Canada is experiencing a wholesome and satisfactory growth; that it is played by increasing numbers of school and college students; and that it is destined to continue to occupy an important place in such educational programs.

L. W. ST. JOHN,
Chairman.

FENCING

During the interim since the appointment of this committee two years ago and until this October, no changes in the rules of the Intercollegiate Fencing Association or the A. F. L. A. have come up. Colonel Henry Breckinridge, Chairman, has not apprised me of any other developments.

At the last annual meeting of the Fencing Association in October, the Council effected various changes in its rules of fencing. Although these modifications have not been accepted by the amateur organization, the A. F. L. A., they have been approved in principle by it and its recommendation that these changes be incorporated into the international rules has been forwarded to the Federation Internationale D'Escrime. It is apparent, therefore, that no further steps are contemplated by the A. F. L. A. pending favorable action by the F. I. E.

And now that an understanding has been arrived at between the A. F. L. A. and I. F. A. for the time being, I am enclosing the set of rule changes for the consideration of the N. C. A. A.

The modified ground rules as proposed by Army and adopted by the Council are effective until the next annual meeting, at which time these same rules will be reconsidered in the light of the 1935 Intercollegiates. They are as follows:

- (1) The width of the fencing strip shall be six (6) feet. The length of the strip shall be forty feet. Three parallel lines shall be drawn across the strip: The dividing line, one (1) inch wide, in the middle; the two warning lines, four (4) inches wide, on either side of the middle line and ten (10) feet therefrom.
- (2) Warnings, other than as provided for by the warning lines, shall be discontinued.
- (3) When a contestant in retreating crosses the end of the strip with both feet, the bout is stopped and the contestant thus stepping off the strip is declared touched.

Other changes made at the meeting are concerned primarily with the rules governing competition of the Intercollegiate Championships, which I do not think will be of interest to the N. C. A. A.

HUGH V. ALESSANDRONI,
Chairman.

FOOTBALL

In my report of last year I emphasized the point that your committee was confronted each year with the necessity of holding the balance true between the needs of the game as a spectacle and the safety of the boys who play.

The pressure increases each year to give more weight to the spectator's satisfactions. Our good friends the writers are constantly, in magazine and newspaper, telling us how much more colorful our game could be made and advising us of the steps we should take in order to increase our gate receipts. If our prime objective is larger gate receipts, then much of their advice is good; but your committee is still old-fashioned enough to feel that the safety of the players comes first.

How Your Committee Operates

In the consideration of the numerous changes suggested each year your committee endeavors to weigh carefully the value of each suggestion to the playing or the officiating of the game, and then, if the consensus of opinion is that it has value, the change is subjected to a careful analysis of its probable effect on the safety of the players. If this analysis indicates that the danger of injury would be increased by the suggested change it is given no further consideration.

Your committee feels that this method of procedure is sound,

and that it is quite possible to keep the game open, interesting, and even spectacular, without adding risks which, while not great for mature men of many years of playing experience, are far too heavy to load on boys of college age.

The Evidence of the Past Season

The past season gives clear-cut evidence that the game requires but little tinkering. It is safe to say that no season has produced more interesting and exciting games, and records indicate a decided reduction in the injury column.

The changes made by your committee last year were few in number and were aimed at strengthening the offense and simplifying the officiating somewhat, through clarification of the existing rules. The results have been most gratifying. The records of the season show an increase in scoring in the major games and a decrease in tie games, especially those of the nothing-to-nothing variety. Some fear was expressed at the beginning of the season that the thinner ball adopted for this year would result in poorer kicking; instead the punting has been improved and kicks of exceptional length have been reported. Goals from the field have settled a number of contests, showing that this play is still an important feature of our game.

Improvement in Officiating

In spite of the fact that officials are human beings and as such quite as liable to make mistakes as coaches, players, or spectators, the record this year has been remarkably free from misinterpretations of the rules. There is steady improvement each year in the officiating all over the country, due largely to the numerous associations of officials which have sprung up and whose members meet regularly to study and discuss the rules. There is greater uniformity in the technique of officiating and in the interpretation of the rules than was formerly the case; also the improvement in coöperation and team-work among officials has been marked. Probably nothing has done so much to bring about this last mentioned advance as the rule giving concurrent jurisdiction over fouls to all four officials.

Of course there are still officials who are overly technical, and also there are rules which by their very character are difficult to enforce because of the hair-line nature of the decisions they render necessary. Officials should strive to master the spirit of the rules and be satisfied if they prevent either team from taking an unfair advantage of the other. Your committee should strive to so frame the rules as to reduce to a minimum the difficulty of enforcing them.

The Lateral Pass

Perhaps the most important problem which your committee faces has to do with the lateral pass. The use of this weapon of offense is growing, and its recent development raises several pertinent questions; one is, shall an attempted lateral which results in an accidental forward pass continue to be penalized by the loss of a down? A second is, shall the rule declaring the ball dead if the runner is so held that his forward progress is stopped be modified to permit lateral and legal forward passing up to the time the passer strikes the ground after a tackle? These are two questions which deserve careful and studied consideration.

In the first case an attempted lateral after a forward pass of considerable length may result in two forward passes on the same play, or an attempted lateral pass made after a long run might result in an illegal forward pass. In either case the entire gain is lost and the ball is brought back to where it was put in play, the penalty being merely the loss of a down. This might be remedied by a short yardage penalty at the spot of the foul, but it must be remembered that each of these fouls can occur behind the line of scrimmage as well as down the field, and in such a case a yardage penalty would be much more severe than the present penalty. Of course a special penalty might be made to apply when the foul occurs beyond the line of scrimmage, but this would add another complication to an already complicated set of rules. Such a change should not be made without a careful scrutiny of how the existing rules and game would be affected.

In the second case we come upon one of those rules which require hair-line decisions by officials. The advocates of more liberal lateral passing rules claim, very rightly, that a lateral pass to be most effective should be made after the runner is tackled. If the runner after being tackled is still moving ahead or falling forward as he makes a backward pass there can be no argument against its legality. If, however, he is completely stopped, or is falling backward, then under a strict interpretation of the existing rule the ball is dead.

Now if the rule is changed to permit lateral passing and legal forward passing up to the time the runner strikes the ground after a tackle, this change takes away the protection of all runners when their forward progress is stopped by a tackle. Players carrying the ball are often stopped in the grasp of an opponent and the whistle saves them from other opponents "sloughing" into them from all directions. This rule was adopted to prevent injury, and your committee must be careful to take no backward step when it considers an amendment to it.

Other questions of importance will doubtless arise, but the two mentioned are stressed because for years there has been a deliberate attempt on the part of the Football Rules Committee

to encourage lateral passing. Therefore it is meet that this committee consider carefully at this time whether or not additional encouragement be given to the use of this play.

Balancing Offense and Defense

An interesting development in college football is the tendency to schedule games only with major opponents. The number of games between strong and weak teams was strikingly less this year. This makes it impossible to judge the present balance of offense and defense by comparing for a large number of teams the total scores for the season or average scores for all games with previous seasons. The Associated Press comparison for the past four seasons is interesting, but scarcely enlightening unless there is taken into consideration this radical change in the making of schedules; also it is necessary to remember that a higher grade of coaching at the smaller colleges has resulted in teams capable of giving battle on more even terms with the teams of the larger institutions. This balance as between offense and defense has been carefully sought during all the years of the existence of your committee. Goal line stands are still one of the high-lights of our game. Clever defense and sharp tackling are quite as interesting and thrilling to the real football lover as hard blocking and clever ball carrying. To evolve a game in which luck and individual performance overshadows sound knowledge of fundamentals and subordinates team play would be to completely change the spirit of our game.

Such are some of the considerations to which we must give thought. Only by looking at the whole picture instead of viewing a single high-light can we hope to keep our game reasonably safe and in balance. In this endeavor we have had sane and sensible coöperation from the Coaches' Association and from the various Officials' Associations. The work of the Football Rules Committee of the Coaches' Association has been especially valuable. It is a tribute to the worth of the game that no matter what the personal interests of its devotees may be they all stand four-square in their desire to protect the game itself.

Decrease in Injuries

It is too early at the time this report is written to speak finally as to injuries and fatalities but the reports so far indicate a decisive reduction in comparison with last year, which in turn showed a marked falling off from the previous year. It is evident, however, that there is still much to be done in the campaign for more careful supervision of school and sand-lot games and the immediate and proper treatment of minor injuries and abrasions. Proper supervision and care of injuries can, and we trust will eventually eliminate most of the fatalities which are now charged to football.

To sum up, the rules and the game seem to have given greater satisfaction than ever this year, and there seems no good reason for any radical changes.

WALTER R. OKESON,
Chairman.

GYMNASTICS

Your Committee planned to hold the first National Collegiate Gymnastic Championships at the University of Chicago on April 7, 1934, and took steps to organize such a contest. The interest and enthusiasm with which it was greeted was great in all sections of the country. Sufficient entries were obtained to insure representation from many institutions and it was with great reluctance that we finally decided to cancel the contest, due to the fact that many of the institutions entering men were unable to finance the trips to Chicago.

We feel that this contest should be held at the University of Chicago in 1935. Already we have received inquiries, and we think that if the financial situation within the individual institutions is better we can easily run the Championships successfully both from a gymnastic and financial standpoint.

We wish to call attention to the ratings of the various long horse jumps and to state that these are temporary. Any changes in these ratings will be made according to the new ratings of the International Gymnastic Federation which are expected in the very near future. These will govern competition in the next Olympic Games and we will do well to adopt them.

The section on Judges and Judging remains the same, but we mention the fact that experiments with different methods of announcing the scores of each judge are being carried out. No results can be expected, however, before 1935.

In the section on Specifications for Apparatus the following changes have been made:—

6e,—Flying Rings,—line 3—to read—"rope and leather straps 18' long", (instead of 17'); also add "Ropes shall be made of woven cotton".

C. A. BELING,
Chairman.

ICE HOCKEY

The annual committee meeting was held in Clinton, N. Y., with four members and three advisory members attending. Consideration was given to various proposed changes and among

those adopted were: that the zones be known as "defending", "neutral", and "attacking"; that no substitution be allowed for a penalized player; that a player taking the place of a goal-keeper, when the goal-keeper is off the ice, shall have the privileges of the goal-keeper and his equipment or similar equipment.

A goal-keeper's "crease" was added, which carried with it the deletion of the interference of vision rule. The rule which governed the playing of the puck and formerly known as the "Off-side" or "On-side" rule was entirely re-worded with supplementary notes covering situations that happen during play. The "anti-defense" rule, which is seldom ever violated and therefore might be deleted, was maintained to prevent a purely defensive style of play. Further consideration must be given to this rule as the penalty is relatively severe when the infraction is slight.

There seems to be evidence of increased interest in the game and more hockey is being played. While amateur and professional rules are quite similar it is necessary to keep in mind that our hockey rules must be comparable with other college rules. The penalty for flagrant unsportsmanlike conduct in college football is disqualification and the penalty is the same in college hockey. Only through continued effort of strict rule application both by players and officials will the game prevail in our schools and colleges.

Officiating last season showed a marked improvement and better uniformity is to be expected this year because of the interest that has already been shown this fall by rules interpretation meetings by groups of officials and coaches.

The committee recommends that the rules be applied as written for the sake of uniformity. It does however welcome constructive recommendations at any time for consideration in the formation of the 1935-1936 rules.

ALBERT I. PRETTYMAN,
Chairman.

LACROSSE

Because of the absence of Mr. Lewis Korn from the country no separate meeting of the National Collegiate Lacrosse Rules Committee was held, but individual members of the committee worked very closely with the Rules Committee of the United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association. During the college year 1933-34 the most important rule changes were in relation to the size of the field, the fixing of definite boundaries, and the restriction on the number of offensive and defensive men who must remain "on side".

The officiating was handled by the neutral appointment of officials by the Chief Referee, Mr. Roy Taylor, and his district representatives.

The sport itself showed great progress in its territorial development, particularly in the First District, where several colleges adopted lacrosse as a spring activity.

The officers of the United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association continue their active work for the improvement of the sport in the colleges.

Submitted, in the absence of Mr. Korn, by

MILLER MOORE, *President,*
United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Assn.

SWIMMING AND WATER SPORTS

The Swimming Rules Committee has had a very active year. Aside from an intensive three day period devoted to the annual championships and rules committee meetings, most of our work has been carried on by correspondence and occasional conferences with nearby committee members. The correspondence and the annual meetings have not been limited to the executive or active members alone, but have included the advisory members from the various N. C. A. A. districts, and frequently also those of the interscholastic advisory group. As in other years, valuable assistance has been received from the intercollegiate and interscholastic swimming coaches associations. Facilitated by overlapping membership, the Committee has coöperated with the A. A. U. and Olympic swimming committees in the solution of common problems. Through these various channels, the Committee has been enabled to render a more truly national service.

The Eleventh Annual Swimming Championships of the N. C. A. A. held at the Ohio State University March 30 and 31, 1934 were reported in considerable detail in the September *News Bulletin* and in the Intercollegiate Swimming Guide, and therefore will receive but brief reference here. The meet was the largest we have ever had in the number of institutions represented and the contestants participating. Unfortunately the net receipts to be pro-rated were nearly the smallest on record. The detailed financial statement of income and expenditures has been sent to all competing institutions and accompanies this report.

The various actions taken by the Committee during the year might be summarized as:

1. The admission to full active membership on the Rules Committee of a representative of the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, namely C. E. Forsythe, Director of Interscholastic Athletics for the State of Michigan.

The Rules Committee is happy to welcome this new coöperation with this greatest of interscholastic bodies whose object is "to protect and regulate the inter-state athletic interests of the high schools belonging to the various associations, and to promote pure amateur sport."

2. A new records committee was appointed to include college, high school, and preparatory school representatives. The committee was instructed to set up separate records for high schools, in addition to those listed at present. For some time a growing dissatisfaction has been expressed against the practice of having a single set of interscholastic records which include the best performances of high school and preparatory school boys. Dissatisfaction arose because preparatory school boys whose official maximum age limit is under twenty-one years were able to monopolize most of the swimming records against the field of high school boys whose official maximum age was limited to less than twenty years. This age difference has been the basis for the opposition of the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations against permitting high school boys to compete against those of preparatory schools. The setting up of a separate classification of best records for high school boys should help correct this evident unfairness. Unfortunately the new records committee were unable to set up the new classification in time for its inclusion in the current Swimming Guide.

3. On recommendation of the Interscholastic Swimming Coaches Association the half gainer and cut away one and one-half dives, which had been eliminated as dangerous two years ago, were reinstated for intercollegiate competition. At the suggestion of interscholastic representatives these dives were not required but made optional for high and preparatory school boys.

4. As a precaution against accidents in diving, a sub-committee on diving has agreed to prepare a body of suggestions to clarify the instructions for divers, and to show how the more difficult dives should be taught in order to avoid injuries. This report is still in process, and when finished will be distributed through the N. C. A. A. *News Bulletin* or the Intercollegiate Swimming Guide.

5. The program of events for the annual N. C. A. A. Championships has been enlarged to include diving from both the one-meter and the three-meter boards. The order of events was changed so that preliminaries will be held on two afternoons, and the finals on each of two evenings. This should make each of the finals of approximately equal importance and attractiveness. Two added exhibition events, one in general watermanship, and one in life saving, are included this year, and give promise of broadening the educational values of the meet.

6. The most comprehensive piece of work completed during the year was the formulation of a code of administrative policies

and procedures for conducting the National Collegiate Swimming Championships. This code is the outgrowth of eleven years of experience in managing the meet and standardizes such considerations as aim; conditions for awarding national championships; general supervision of championships; meet committee; manager of the meet; time of meet; program and order of events; pool; equipment for diving; entry blanks; entry fees; tickets; scale of prices; contestants and their eligibility; awards; official program; publicity; financial guarantee; complimentary tickets; expenses for visiting teams; pro-rating of net income; report of meet; liability of association; rules changes governing championships; and conformity with N. C. A. A. policies.

A sub-committee, consisting of A. E. Eilers of Washington University, E. T. Kennedy of Columbia, R. J. H. Kiphuth of Yale, and the chairman, have been chiefly responsible for this code. It has been approved by the rules committee as a whole, and the N. C. A. A. Executive Committee, and appears in the 1935 edition of the Guide recently published.

The organization, editing, and publication of our annual Swimming Guide has become one of the most important subsidiary activities of the committee. E. T. Kennedy, for years a member of the active Rules Committee and editor of the Guide for the past three years, was again appointed editor. The current Guide was published about the middle of November and thanks to the editor and to the publisher, Mr. Doyle, it measures up to the standard of the best Guides of the past.

The decision of the International Swimming Federation in 1928, reaffirmed in Los Angeles in 1932, to debar life guards from Olympic competition is looming as a puzzling problem with wide ramifications. The official regulation reads, "Bath attendants, surf bathing attendants, or life guards performing life saving as part of their duties, for which they have accepted remuneration, thereby lose their amateur status." Mr. Brundage, President of the American Olympic Association and other members of the Olympic Committee, feel that in order to retain American membership in the International Swimming Federation and eligibility for Olympic competition, American swimmers must conform to this standard. The swimming rules committees of the bodies comprising the American Olympic Association and the constituent bodies themselves are being urged to accept this standard of eligibility to govern all their competitive swimming, and to advise their swimmers accordingly. The N. C. A. A. and its affiliated conferences, leagues, associations, and other membership are called upon for cooperation to this end.

Recently, on being asked by mail vote to register its attitude, your Swimming Rules Committee, including its active and advisory membership, appeared to be about equally divided for and against this international regulation. College and university swimmers have been widely sought as life guards and in that

capacity have rendered uncommonly good safety service. Although the remuneration has been small, many young men swimmers have chosen life guard duty as an attractive form of summer occupation and recreation. The problem is especially baffling since the collegiate constituency of the American Olympic Association had no voice in the formulation of the life guard rule, and since the present standard will govern participation in the 1936 Olympics, and since no modification can be made until thereafter. Obviously nonconformity means exclusion from 1936 Olympic swimming. Under the circumstances it appears that the only sportsmanlike course to take is to comply fully with the regulation. However, the Rules Committee is herewith bringing this information to the attention of the N. C. A. A. and its Council for further guidance and instructions. Whatever action is taken by intercollegiate and interscholastic athletic organizations will undoubtedly be awaited with interest and should have far reaching consequences.

Another Olympic problem in the solution of which the Swimming Rules Committee and the N. C. A. A. constituency should share is already before us in the task of raising funds for the needs of American participation in the 1936 Games. Naturally this is part of the larger problem of financial support of all American participation. In this connection President Brundage writes that

"1. Due to current economic conditions, the resistance to public appeal for funds will probably be greater than ever, and more and more reliance will have to be placed on the games committees.

2. The theory that each sport should pay the way of its representatives in the Olympic Games gains support each year.

3. Inasmuch as it may be impossible to send teams in those sports for which there are insufficient earmarked funds, every games committee should plan on raising at least the amount of its budget."

The theory advanced by Mr. Brundage that the friends of each sport should pay the way of its representatives seems essentially sound in principle and worthy of active support. The Rules Committee, in cooperation with the Olympic Men's Swimming Committee, is therefore preparing plans for this national cooperative enterprise. Although our financial plans are still tentative, preparations are being made for regional pre-Olympic development meets, water carnivals, and the showing of moving pictures of outstanding swimmers, in which local institutions may aid by providing facilities, leadership, and participants. The net proceeds are to be turned over to the American Olympic Committee earmarked for Olympic Men's Swimming. The Rules Committee invites your cooperation in this project.

F. W. LUEHRING,
Chairman.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

11TH ANNUAL NATIONAL COLLEGIATE SWIMMING CHAMPIONSHIPS

The Ohio State University, March 30-31, 1934

Receipts \$992.60

Gate Receipts

Entry Fees:

Carnegie Institute of Technology	\$2.00
Case School of Applied Science	3.00
Colgate University	5.00
Columbia University	4.00
Dartmouth College	1.00
Fordham University	2.00
Franklin and Marshall College	1.00
Lafayette College	1.00
Loyola University	2.00
Miami University	1.00
Michigan State College	1.00
Northwestern University	6.00
Ohio State University	8.00
Princeton University	1.00
Randolph-Macon College	1.00
Rutgers University	8.00
Springfield College (Mass.)	8.00
United States Naval Academy	5.00
University of Illinois	4.00
University of Iowa	16.00
University of Michigan	20.00
University of Minnesota	8.00
University of Nebraska	1.00
University of Pittsburgh	2.00
University of Oklahoma	4.00
University of Southern California	16.00
Washburn College	2.00
Washington	4.00
West Chester State Teachers College	1.00
Williams College	2.00
Yale University	11.00

151.00

Total \$1,143.60

Disbursements

Press of Hollenback—Entry blanks	\$14.00
Southard Callendar & Printing Co.—Officials' badges and contestants' buttons	7.50
Hiss Stamp Co.—300 contestants' badges	17.39
University Print Shop—250 posters	5.85
Dieges & Clust—Medals and plaques	193.53
Toledo Ticket Co.—Tickets	17.72
Studio Signs—8 cards	2.00
Emilie Sullivan Studios—Costume rental	11.00
Western Union Telegraph Co.—Telegrams	18.44
Ohio State University—Telephone charges	1.10
R. J. H. Kiphuth—Reimbursing for long distance phone call re. Mr. Kurtz	5.80

Nathan McCoy, Postmaster—1½c. stamped envelopes	4.41
Warehouse, O. S. U.—Mimeograph paper, stencils, envelopes, and stamps	30.83
Laboratory Supply Store—Safety pins	.07
Services:	
John Moore—Clerical, general office	9.60
Guards, ticket takers and ticket sellers	32.40
Jos. Thomas—Printing 53 signs (contestants' names, numbers, etc.)	7.95
Operation of loud speaker and lighting units (2 men)	10.00
Police protection	49.00
Check room attendant and guards	39.80
Tax on Admissions: Federal tax	90.00
State tax	97.80
	666.19
Balance to be Pro-rated	\$477.41
By agreement, 50% of profit on N. C. A. A. and A. A. U. programs	69.20
Total to be Pro-rated	\$546.61

TRACK AND FIELD

In addition to the usual work of studying the rules and editing the Track Guide, the Track and Field Rules Committee this year assisted the Games Committee for the N. C. A. A. Track and Field Meet by nominating the outstanding athletes from each district who were to be guaranteed travel expenses to Los Angeles.

The Committee held its annual meeting at Los Angeles on June 22, 1934, with seven members attending. A number of proposals for rule changes and for popularizing track meets were studied and informal action taken. The rule changes informally approved at the meeting were later submitted to the full membership of the Committee for mail vote. Only two important rule changes were authorized:

1. The rules covering qualifying and order of competition in Field events were revised. In the throwing events and the broad jump, four preliminary and four final trials are allowed in one-session meets. In two-session meets there are to be four preliminary, two semi-final, and four final trials. The semi-final round may be held in either session or omitted altogether at the discretion of the Games Committee. In the throwing events and the broad jump, trials are to be taken in "alternating pairs", except in the semi-final and final rounds of two session meets when they are to be taken in "flights".

2. The definition of a legal high jump was modified to conform to the new rule of the International Federation which legalizes all jumps made from a one-foot take-off.

T. N. METCALF,
Chairman.

N. C. A. A. TRACK AND FIELD CHAMPIONSHIPS

June 22, 23, 1934, at Los Angeles

For the first time in the history of the N. C. A. A. Track and Field Championships, the Thirteenth Annual Meet was held in some other locality than Chicago. The University of Southern California had the very distinct privilege of acting as host to this great meet in the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum in Los Angeles, California.

It was with a feeling of confidence so far as interest in track and field athletics is concerned that the University agreed to guarantee the sum of \$20,000 for expense allowances for the outstanding athletes of the country. The Track and Field Rules Committee, with T. Nelson Metcalf as chairman, was authorized to select the outstanding athletes of the country, based upon performances of the 1934 season. Their selection resulted in expense allowances being assured to approximately 189 athletes from 78 different colleges and universities.

The University of Southern California was happy to submit the net receipts of the meet, deducting from the gross only the actual operating expense, for the prorata distribution to those who did not share in the original expense, and based upon the rules of distribution of the N. C. A. A. These net receipts permitted an additional distribution of approximately one-half of the Pullman and railroad transportation to the additional competing athletes, members of the Rules Committee who attended, members of the Technical Committee who attended, and to coaches who accompanied three or more athletes. The rate of pro-rating was 48.29%. And so, from a financial standpoint, considering the expenditure of any individual institution, the expense of representation was reduced to the minimum.

The city of Los Angeles certainly showed its appreciation of a meet of this calibre by patronizing it to the extent of gross receipts totaling in the neighborhood of \$32,000, which no doubt is the largest amount of gross receipts that has ever been taken in at any N. C. A. A. Championship Meet.

In writing of the meet it is difficult to select any outstanding event. The great finish of the mile run between Bonthron and Cunningham, the great quarter-mile run between Glen Hardin and Ivan Fuqua, the blanket finish of the high hurdles, the phenomenal burst of speed on the part of Hardin to win the 220-yard low hurdles, the double victory of Ralph Metcalf, the duel between Lyman and Torrance in the shot put, the memorable throw of the discus on the part of Dunn on his last throw, which assured Stanford of a victory—in fact each and every event could be cited for its outstanding performances and interest on the part of the spectator.

The establishing of records by Glenn Hardin, Louisiana State,

in the 440-yard run, William Bonthron, Princeton University, in the one mile run, Jack Rand, San Diego State Teachers' College, pole vault, Jack Torrance, Louisiana State, 16 lb. shot put, Robert Parke, Oregon University, javelin, and the record tied by Glenn Hardin, Louisiana State, 220-yard low hurdle, is again significant of the calibre of the competition. In other words, from the standpoint of intercollegiate track and field athletics, certainly this thirteenth N. C. A. A. meet was second to none in the history of track and field athletics.

There were entries from 89 colleges and universities and 323 individual entrants. When one considers the fact that in this entry list there were approximately 10 of the nation's outstanding athletes in each and every event, it is significant of the calibre of the competition.

The University of Southern California was honored to act as host to the Thirteenth Annual Track and Field Championships of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

W. O. HUNTER,
Chairman, Games Committee.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

OF THE

THIRTEENTH NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION TRACK AND FIELD MEET

Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum, June 22-23, 1934

Income

Gross receipts from ticket sales	\$32,398.64	
Less Government tax	2,862.05	
		\$29,536.59
Kid gate receipts		211.17
Program sales (less printing costs, commissions, etc.)		828.76
Total		\$30,576.52

Expenditures

Salaries and wages		
News bureau	\$120.00	
Stadium	2,494.75	
Ticket department	672.00	
Training quarters	180.20	
		\$3,466.95

Office supplies and expense		
Messenger service	\$47.30	
Postage	124.83	
Printing, mimeographing, etc.	637.71	
Telephone and telegraph	56.73	
		866.57
Publicity folders, posters, etc.		
Printing, art work, etc.	\$809.55	
Photographic work	155.32	
Postage	525.00	
Rental street banners, etc.	128.90	
		1,618.77
Travel and entertainment		
Coaches banquet	\$198.20	
Luncheons, etc. (Newspaper men)	242.43	
Speakers, etc. (Mileage)	84.50	
		525.13
Materials and services		
Medals	\$479.36	
Printing tickets, badges, etc.	528.06	
Rental Western Electric timer	284.53	
Technical equipment and supplies	476.00	
		1,767.95
Other		
Preparing track, etc.—Coliseum	\$1,543.47	
Rental and insurance—Coliseum	586.17	
Services of band musicians	215.00	
Travel expense allowances (guaranteed)	20,000.00	
Reserve for outstanding bills, etc.	200.00	
		22,544.64
Total		\$30,790.01
Deficit		\$213.49

[A later report of Mr. Hunter to Mr. Metcalf, dated Nov. 8, 1934, shows receipts of \$31,085.31 and expenses \$11,036.30.—Secretary]

RESULTS

THIRTEENTH NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION TRACK MEET

TRACK EVENTS

1 Mile Run:

Place	Entrant	Affiliation	Electric Time Min. Sec.
Official Time: 4:08.9			
First	Bonthron, William	Princeton University	4:09.71
Second	Cunningham, Glenn	Kansas, University of	4:10.57
Third	Venzke, Gene	Pennsylvania, University of	4:15.18
Fourth	Williamson, Harry	North Carolina, University of	4:15.23
Fifth	Pongrace, Otto	Michigan State College	4:19
Sixth	Nimmo, Charles	Stanford University	4:19.61

440 Yard Run:

Place	Entrant	Affiliation	Electric Time Sec. Tenths
Official Time: 47 Seconds			
First	Hardin, Glenn	Louisiana State	47.09
Second	Fuqua, Ivan	Indiana, University of	47.51
Third	McCarthy, John	Southern California	47.85
Fourth	Brothers, Louis	Rice Institute	47.99½
Fifth	Ablowich, Edgar	Southern California	48.11
Sixth	Fitch, Al	Southern California	48.12

100 Yard Dash:

Place	Entrant	Affiliation	Electric Time Sec. Tenths
Official Time: 9.7 Seconds			
First	Metcalf, Ralph	Marquette University	9.78
Tie for			
Second	Russell, Hunter	Illinois, University of	9.80
Tie for			
Second	Parsons, Charles	Southern California	9.80
Fourth	Draper, Foy	Southern California	9.97
Fifth	Willson, James	Stanford University	9.98
Sixth	Dupree, Sterling	Alabama Polytechnic Institute	10.2½

120 Yard High Hurdles:

Place	Entrant	Affiliation	Electric Time Sec. Tenths
Official Time: 14.4 Seconds			
First	Klopstock, Sam	Stanford University	14.63
Second	Oliver, Amsden	Miami University	14.65
Third	Fisher, George	Louisiana State College	14.66
Fourth	Allen, Sam	Oklahoma Baptist	14.67
Fifth	Bacon, Ned	Denison College	14.79
Sixth	Haring, Lee	Kansas State Teachers College	14.97

880 Yard Run:

Place	Entrant	Affiliation	Electric Time Min. Sec.
Official Time: 1:51.9			
First	Hornbostel, Charles	Indiana University	1:52.01
Second	Miller, James	California, Univ. at L. A.	1:53.05
Third	Ray, William	Manhattan College	1:53.22
Fourth	Robinson, Elroy	Fresno State College	1:53.48
Fifth	Johnson, Estel	Southern California	1:54.73
Sixth	O'Neal, Ted	Louisiana State University	1:55.24

220 Yard Dash:

Place	Entrant	Affiliation	Electric Time Sec. Tenths
Official Time: 20.9 Seconds			
First	Metcalf, Ralph	Marquette University	21.04
Second	Parsons, Charles	Southern California	21.38
Third	Willson, James	Stanford University	21.60
Fourth	Draper, Foy	Southern California	21.69
Fifth	Dupree, Sterling	Alabama Polytechnic Institute	21.74
Sixth	Hall, Ed	Kansas, University of	21.98

Two Mile Run:

Place	Entrant	Affiliation	Electric Time Min. Sec.
			Official Time: 9:22.4
First	Crowley, Ray	Manhattan College	9:22.82
Second	Zepp, William	Michigan Normal	9:23.12
Third	Sears, Raymond	Butler University	9:30.04
Fourth	Wagner, Bob	Oregon, University of	9:32.80
Fifth	Sanders, John	Louisiana State	9:35.58
Sixth	Lochner, Floyd	Oklahoma, University of	9:39.10

220 Yard Low Hurdles:

Place	Entrant	Affiliation	Electric Time Sec. Tenths
			Official Time: 22.7 Seconds*
First	Hardin, Glenn	Louisiana State	23.17
Second	Oliver, Amsden	Miami University	23.23
Third	Lambertus, Heye	Nebraska, University of	23.54
Fourth	Reel, Vincent	Occidental College	23.84
Fifth	Randow, W. H.	Texas A. & M.	24.01
Sixth	Bacon, Ned	Denison University	24.03

* A new world's record.

FIELD EVENTS

Entrant	Affiliation	Best Effort in Finals Feet Inches	Winning Effort Feet Inches	Place
Shot Put:				
Torrance, J.	Louisiana State	53 13 $\frac{3}{8}$	54 6 $\frac{7}{8}$	First
Lyman, J.	Stanford University	53 3 $\frac{5}{8}$	53 7 $\frac{3}{4}$	Second
Theodoratus, G.	Washington State	51 10	52 10 $\frac{1}{8}$	Third
Dunn, G.	Stanford University	51 1 $\frac{5}{8}$	52 1 $\frac{1}{4}$	Fourth
Irwin, B.	Texas A & M College	48 2 $\frac{1}{2}$	51 2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Fifth
Harper, H.	Southern California	50 3 $\frac{7}{8}$	50 3 $\frac{7}{8}$	Sixth

Discus:

Entrant	Affiliation	Best Effort Feet Inches	Winning Effort Feet Inches	Place
Dunn, G.	Stanford University	162 7	162 7	First
Carpenter, Ken	Southern California	151 7 $\frac{1}{8}$	155 9 $\frac{1}{4}$	Second
Lyman, J.	Stanford University	155 1 $\frac{7}{8}$	155 1 $\frac{7}{8}$	Third
Irwin, B.	Texas A & M College	145 9 $\frac{1}{8}$	150 3	Fourth
Busbee, Wes	Indiana University	149 8 $\frac{3}{8}$	149 8 $\frac{3}{8}$	Fifth
Cruickshank, C.	Colorado Agr. College	141 2 $\frac{3}{4}$	148 5 $\frac{7}{8}$	Sixth

Broad Jump:

Entrant	Affiliation	Best Effort Feet Inches	Winning Effort Feet Inches	Place
Olson, Al	Southern California	23 8	25 4 $\frac{1}{4}$	First
Clark, Robert	California, Univ. of	24 3 $\frac{1}{4}$	24 6 $\frac{3}{8}$	Second
Little, Henry	William and Mary	23 5	24 1 $\frac{3}{4}$	Third (tie)
Wilson, Floyd	Fresno State College	24 1 $\frac{3}{4}$	24 1 $\frac{3}{4}$	Third (tie)
Meagher, G.	Notre Dame University	23 10 $\frac{1}{2}$	24 3 $\frac{3}{8}$	Fifth
Taylor, D.	San Jose State College	23 7 $\frac{3}{4}$	23 10 $\frac{5}{8}$	Sixth

High Jump:

Entrant	Affiliation	Place	Best Effort Feet Inches
Marty, Walter	Fresno State Teachers	Tie for 1st	6 6 $\frac{3}{4}$
Spitz, George	New York University	Tie for 1st	6 6 $\frac{3}{4}$
Richey, Lloyd	Alabama Poly. Inst.	Third	6 2
Spencer, Howard	Geneva College	Tie for 4th	6
Murphy, Vincent	Notre Dame University	Tie for 4th	6
Brannan, Will	Southern California	Tie for 4th	6
Woodbury, S. T.	Dartmouth College	Tie for 4th	6

Pole Vault:

Entrant	Affiliation	Place	Best Effort Feet Inches
Rand, Jack	San Diego State	First	14 1 $\frac{1}{2}$
Deacon, Bernard	Stanford University	Second	13 9
Van Tress, Charles	California, Univ. of	Tie for 3rd	13 6
Seely, Irv.	Illinois, Univ. of	Tie for 3rd	13 6
Massey, Scott	California at L. A.	Tie for 3rd	13 6
Fimple, James	Southern California	Tie for 3rd	13 6
Lowry, Ray	Michigan Normal	Tie for 3rd	13 6

Javelin:

Entrant	Affiliation	Winning Effort Feet Inches	Place
Parke, R.	Oregon, Univ. of	220 11 $\frac{5}{8}$	First
Mottram, J.	Stanford University	216 5 $\frac{1}{2}$	Second
LeGore, R.	North Carolina, Univ.	213 11	Third
Blair, N.	Louisiana State	213 7 $\frac{3}{4}$	Fourth
Odell, H.	Manhattan College	207	Fifth
Reitz, William	California at L. A.	206 3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Sixth

Hammer Throw:

Entrant	Affiliation	Place	Best Effort Feet Inches
Dreyer, Henry	Rhode Island State	First	169 8 $\frac{3}{8}$
Zaremba, Pete	New York University	Second	168 2
Favor, Don	Maine, University of	Third	164 3 $\frac{1}{2}$
Cruickshank, C.	Colorado Agr. College	Fourth	163 10 $\frac{3}{4}$
Miller, Gantt	West Virginia, Univ. of	Fifth	162 3 $\frac{1}{4}$
Cahners, Norman	Harvard University	Sixth	149 3
Burrows, John	Amherst College	Seventh	147 5 $\frac{3}{4}$

WRESTLING

Annual Meet

The annual National Collegiate Wrestling Championships were held at the University of Michigan on March 23rd and 24th. From the standpoint of grade of wrestling and close competition, this meet compared favorably with any of our previous meets. All preliminary and final arrangements for the meet were handled in a masterly fashion by the University of Michigan representatives, and the Wrestling Rules Committee takes this opportunity

to express its hearty appreciation to Mr. Clifford Keen and his assistants for the large amount of time and energy they expended to make the meet such a great success and for the many courtesies extended to the visiting contestants, coaches, and committee members. The facilities for the conduct of the meet could not have been improved upon. A detailed report of the meet may be found in Volume II, Number 4, of the *National Collegiate Athletic Association News-Bulletin*.

The following table will show the relative number of individual contestants and institutions represented in the seven Annual National Collegiate Wrestling Meets:

		Individual Contestants	Institutions Represented
1st Meet—Iowa State College	1928	40	16
2nd Meet—Pennsylvania State College	1929	61	25
3rd Meet—Ohio State University	1930	79	29
4th Meet—Brown University	1931	67	26
5th Meet—Indiana University	1932	75	24
6th Meet—Lehigh University	1933	86	30
7th Meet—University of Michigan	1934	77	23

From the standpoints of number of paid admissions, gate receipts, and resulting refunds to the visiting contestants, the 1934 meet was far less successful than last year's meet at Lehigh. In 1933, eleven hundred and thirty-nine individuals paid two dollars and fifty cents each for a blanket ticket, good for all four sessions of the National Collegiate Wrestling Championships. In 1934, only twenty-six individuals bought blanket tickets at one dollar and a half each. In addition, six hundred and twelve individual admissions were sold at forty cents each for the preliminary and semi-final sessions, and three hundred and twenty-four individual admissions were sold at seventy-five cents for the final session on Saturday evening. Average attendance at each of the four sessions at Ann Arbor was approximately two hundred and fifty as compared with at least one thousand at Lehigh in 1933. The total gate receipts at Ann Arbor in 1934 were \$500.13 as compared with \$2,676.65, in 1933, leaving, after deduction of Federal and State amusement taxes, net gross receipts of \$2,485.25. In the opinion of the writer, the difference in these gate receipts is due to the difference in methods of handling athletic finances in the East and the Middle-West rather than to any great difference in interest in intercollegiate wrestling in these two sections of the country. In the Middle-West, it is the common practice for the athletic management to sell admission books, good for all intercollegiate contests held under the supervision of the Board of Athletic Control. When the student buys one of these athletic books, he figures that he is paying primarily for admission to the football games—and possibly basketball contests—with admission to other sports thrown in, but in reality he is, of course, paying for admission to

all sports. In the East, on the other hand, it is a common practice for the athletic management to sell individual admissions to each athletic contest or possibly to sell a book of coupons good for all intercollegiate competition in a particular sport. The Eastern student is, therefore, in the habit of paying directly to see competition in wrestling and similar sports, and consequently he is much more apt to look favorably upon paying to see a National Collegiate Wrestling Meet than the Western student.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE ANNUAL MEET

<i>Receipts:</i>	
Gate Receipts (less tax)	\$500.13
Entry fees—77 @ \$2.00 each	154.00
Total Receipts	\$654.13
<i>Disbursements:</i>	
Printing, postage, telegraph, etc.	\$147.57
Labor	79.65
Officials	40.00
Trophies	157.20
Luncheon (Coaches and Rules Committee)	23.18
Incidentals	31.61
Total local expenses	479.21
Balance for refund	\$174.92
Total cost of transportation of contestants and coaches	\$1,612.61
Percentage of refund	10.8% (plus)

Changes in Rules

The Wrestling Rules Committee held numerous meetings on March 22nd, 23rd, and 24th in connection with the annual meet, and gave careful consideration to the numerous proposals for changes in the wrestling rules. Comparatively few changes were approved, however, and most of these concern clarification rather than actual changes in intent of the present rules.

National Collegiate Wrestling Coaches Association

The annual meeting of the Wrestling Coaches' Association was held, as usual, in connection with the National Collegiate Wrestling Meet.

The following officers were re-elected for the year 1934-35:

President—William Sheridan, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.

Vice-President—Dr. O. H. Stuteville, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Secretary-Treasurer—Hugo Otopalik, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

Executive Committee—Ed O'Donnell, Yale University.

William H. Thom, Indiana University.

P. H. Quinlan, University of North Carolina.

Most of the meeting was devoted to discussion of suggested improvements in the wrestling rules to be recommended to the Wrestling Rules Committee for adoption.

*Participation of National Collegiate Athletic Association
in American Olympic Wrestling*

At the first meeting of the American Olympic Wrestling Committee which was held in April at Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, the following action of interest to the National Collegiate Athletic Association was taken:

- I. The 1936 Annual National Collegiate Wrestling Championships were made the semi-final American Olympic Wrestling Try-outs for college wrestlers—with the agreement that the winners of first and second places in each weight class would thereby qualify for the Final American Olympic Wrestling Try-outs.
- II. It was voted to hold the 1935 meeting of the American Olympic Wrestling Committee at the time and place of the Annual National Collegiate Wrestling Championships.
- III. Dr. R. G. Clapp was elected Secretary of the American Olympic Wrestling Committee.

Interest in Intercollegiate and Interscholastic Wrestling

Reports from various sections of the country indicate that in many districts there is a marked increase in interest and participation in amateur wrestling, and other sections report no appreciable change.

The following reports are worthy of mention:—

Mr. Clifford J. Gallagher, of Harvard University, writes as follows: "The interest in wrestling in New England has increased in a tremendous way. Practically all of the preparatory schools and high schools are having regular scheduled meets with outside competition. The type of wrestling in the colleges of New England is far superior to that of a few years ago, which all goes to prove the increase in interest."

Mr. H. A. Stone, of the University of California, reports that twelve colleges and universities on the Pacific Coast have intercollegiate teams, and annual championship meets are held in

California and in the Northwest. Many of the high schools also have interscholastic teams.

Mr. J. G. B. McKusick, of the University of Minnesota, reports that over eighty-five high schools in Minnesota participated in wrestling last year. A Minnesota state high school meet was held last year for the first time, and plans have already been made for a much larger tournament in 1935.

Oklahoma and Iowa still stand out as the hotbeds of amateur wrestling, and Omaha, Nebraska, continues to excel any other city in the country in the number of high school boys participating in interscholastic wrestling competition.

R. G. CLAPP,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

FEDERAL ADMISSIONS TAX

On behalf of the committee created for the purpose of representing the Association in its assistance in any suitable litigation that might test the constitutionality of the Federal Revenue Act as amended in 1932 so as to make the Admissions Tax applicable to educational institutions, I offer the following rather informal report:

It will be recalled that the committee, consisting of Professor Owens of Stanford University, Major Fleming, then of the United States Military Academy, and the writer, was created at the Pasadena meeting in July, 1932. The Federal Revenue Act had then recently been so amended as to eliminate the exemption of events, the proceeds of which inured to the benefit of educational institutions. At that meeting it was pointed out that the Act as thus amended was open to grave question as to its constitutionality, in so far at least as it affected the games and contests sponsored by state supported institutions. The Association concluded to lend its support to a suitable case in which it might be expected that the United States Supreme Court would definitely settle the legal questions involved.

With that end in view, the committee was created, and it in turn secured from member institutions pledges of financial support sufficient to warrant the engagement, tentatively at least, of special counsel who might assist the regular attorneys of the institution that should be a party to such litigation in making the most effective presentation of the problem to the courts. Arrangements were made with Mr. Newton D. Baker, of Cleveland, Ohio, whose eminence among lawyers is fully recognized, to act as such special counsel.

As reported last year, all further steps had to await the institution of a suitable law suit. The Association, as such, obviously could not be a party to the litigation. A test case could arise either by an action instituted by the government, by some college or university against the government seeking to prevent the collection of the tax, or finally, probably by a suit instituted by a local tax payer against the state supported institution, seeking to enjoin the latter from complying with the provisions of the Tax Act.

The first item in this report of the committee is that no case has come to our attention behind which we felt we would be warranted in placing the resources of the Association. There are rumors to the effect that the Government has instituted proceedings in two instances, one at West Virginia, the other at Georgia. It has been difficult to get any exact information as to

what the status of these situations really is. As pointed out, to the committee these cases exist only by rumor. Within the last month there has been some indication that litigation might arise involving another institution whose situation would make a splendid test case.

Since over two years have elapsed since the member institutions were requested to pledge their financial support to the common cause, it would seem that, while such pledges may not have lapsed, legally speaking, renewals thereof should be secured before any actions are taken committing the Association to expenditures of any consequence.

No new factor has appeared in the situation affecting the opinion that the Admissions Tax is unconstitutional as applied to state supported institutions. As time has gone by, however, and the need for tax receipts to finance the seemingly unlimited expenditures of the general government has become more pronounced, more and more a perfectly natural inclination to resolve all possible doubts in favor of the government must be recognized.

While there is no assurance that there will be any specific task for the committee to perform, it would seem not unreasonable to continue the committee for at least another year.

RALPH W. AIGLER,
Chairman.

RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING

Your committee, composed of Dr. D. A. Penick, of the University of Texas; Prof. H. Diederichs, of Cornell University; Prof. Geo. L. Rider, of Miami University; Prof. C. E. Bilheimer, of Gettysburg College; and Z. G. Clevenger, of Indiana University, Chairman, appointed one year ago to study the question of recruiting and subsidizing, then to draw up a statement on the subject, to be submitted to the Council and Convention of the N. C. A. A., pointing out the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate recruiting and subsidizing, has given careful and rather comprehensive thought to this most vexing of all problems in relation to athletic competition.

Some of our committee felt that perhaps it would be a little better to use the terms "justifiable" and "unjustifiable" rather than "legitimate" and "illegitimate". It was thought that these terms might be more applicable to real conditions.

Rules and regulations of all the leading conferences, colleges, and universities of the United States were secured and studied by each member of the committee. After this information had been in the hands of the members for some time, a meeting of

the committee, with the full membership in attendance, was held in Washington, D. C. At this meeting a thorough and complete discussion was had, with each member stating most frankly his conclusions with regard to specific and general conditions.

Recruiting and subsidizing go hand in hand; one naturally follows the other in most instances. They are so closely related that it is almost impossible to consider one without considering the other. They have grown to such a universal extent that they constitute the major problem of amateur athletics today. They involve so many things in institutions, their ramifications are so far-reaching inside and out of institutions, that the complete solution is a long way in the future. However, even in view of this, it is felt that some improvement, some advancement toward a more wholesome and more sportsmanlike condition, can be attained by defining what is proper and what is improper, and then by trying to cause all higher educational institutions to approximate to this plane of equality, fairness, and sportsmanship.

The committee has the feeling that a statement of what is justifiable and what is unjustifiable, and nothing more, would be merely a reiteration of the rules and regulations governing conferences and leading institutions of the country. These codes cover in a pretty satisfactory manner most points of controversy. The great fault has been that the rules and regulations have not been adhered to as they should have been. They have not been, and are not being, faithfully observed. The committee has the conviction that a restatement of what is justifiable and what is unjustifiable in recruiting and subsidizing is distinctly called for, with the recommendation that it be adopted by the N. C. A. A., and sent to the presidents of the member institutions, and to competent high school authorities, with the request that the code be given earnest consideration with a view to general adoption.

The committee recommends the following code of approval:

- (1) It is unjustifiable for a student to receive any subsidy of monetary value, either directly or indirectly, primarily for his athletic services.
- (2) It is unjustifiable to employ prospective athletes before they matriculate in an institution, or to make advance payment to a prospective student for future services, or to make any guarantee of payment which is not conditioned upon the service being performed in advance of the payment, or to make any payment for services at a rate greater than the current rate for other students in the institution.
- (3) It is unjustifiable to permit a boy to participate in inter-collegiate contests who has ever received a loan, scholar-

ship aid, remission of fees, or employment, primarily because he is an athlete, through channels not open to non-athletes equally with athletes.

- (4) It is unjustifiable for members of athletic or physical education staffs to recruit athletes by initiating correspondence or conversation, or by arranging for interviews with boys who are prospective athletes.
- (5) It is unjustifiable to promise prospective athletes employment, loans, scholarships, or remission of fees, except as they may be secured by other students through the regular channels of the institution, and those channels should be outside the athletic or physical education departments.
- (6) It is unjustifiable for alumni groups, clubs, fraternities, or other organizations to make promises of direct or indirect subsidies to prospective students, primarily for their athletic ability.
- (7) It is unjustifiable to endeavor to persuade a prospective athlete, by offer of a scholarship or a job, or by any other means, to transfer from a college where he has made application for admission and has been accepted.
- (8) It is justifiable to permit athletes to work in any department of the university as long as they give full return in work and receive the same rate of pay as is given to other students.
- (9) It is justifiable for members of the athletic or physical education staff in speeches, or in response to direct inquiries, to point out what they believe to be the educational advantages of the institution which they represent.

Z. G. CLEVENGER,
Chairman.

ELIGIBILITY OF JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS

At the meeting of the Council held September 22, 1934, the status of the student who transfers from a Junior college was raised and a committee was appointed to study the athletic eligibility of such transfers and to report conditions to the Council.

Members of the committee were asked to re-read the address of President Vande Bogart which appeared in the N. C. A. A. Proceedings for January 1, 1930, and to answer the following questions:

"First. What is the definition of a 'Junior College' which is generally accepted in your district or by conferences of which you have knowledge?

"Second. What is the practice in your district concerning the one-year residence rule when students transfer from a Junior college to a four-year college or university?

"Third. Have regulations covering the subject been adopted by conferences or associations operating in your districts?

"Fourth. What are the other problems in your district which should be investigated and reported upon to the Council in order to give it a fair picture of the whole situation?"

Since the western states have had more experience with this problem, reports were received from the sixth, seventh, and eighth districts which were especially valuable.

1. In general the Junior college is one which requires graduation from a high school for admission, and has a two-year program which is roughly equivalent to the first two years of a regular four-year college curriculum. The Junior college does not grant a degree.

In some states, there are lists of approved Junior colleges.

2. In the East there has been but little experience with students who transferred from a Junior to a degree-granting college or to a university and there is no uniformity in applying the one-year residence rule or in suspending the rule in such cases.

In the Third District, the Southern and Southeastern Conferences permit a student graduated from a recognized or accredited Junior college to participate in intercollegiate athletics at once on transfer to a degree-granting institution.

In the Fourth District, the Western Intercollegiate Conference and the Ohio Conference require that a transfer from a Junior college remain in residence for one year before participating in intercollegiate athletics.

In the Fifth District, the Missouri Valley Conference imposes the one-year residence rule on transfers from a Junior college before participation in intercollegiate athletics.

In the Sixth District, Professor Penick of the Southwestern Athletic Conference reports as follows:

"The athletic conferences in this district, for the most part, have a regulation which permits approved Junior college graduates to become eligible for varsity competition immediately, with the understanding that they will be allowed only two years of competition. Such a graduate has the option of entering a Senior college as a regular

transfer with the one-year residential requirement and the privilege of three years of competition. Junior college transfers who are not graduates must follow the regular transfer rule—that is, one year of residence before eligibility, followed by three years of possible participation."

In the Seventh District, Professor Macdonald reports for the Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference that transfers from Junior colleges must establish residence exactly the same as freshmen. These rules are slightly different from those usually observed in the East, as for instance a participant in intercollegiate basketball, swimming, wrestling, and boxing is required to be in residence only the preceding semester or quarter.

"The regulation was adopted some six or eight years ago. In December, 1931, a committee was appointed to give further consideration to the question. That committee reported in December, 1932, that 'the present rule be retained'. So far as I know, no change is contemplated at the present time." (Professor Macdonald, November 14, 1934.)

A later report, dated December 8, 1934, from Professor Macdonald states that the Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference in meeting that day had adopted a new rule concerning Junior colleges, as follows:

"Transfer students from Junior colleges must establish residence under the regular rules for freshmen. (One-year rule.)

"Exception: A graduate of a Junior college having met the provisions of Rule 1 (admission) may continue uninterrupted competition in a conference institution, subject to the limits of total participation."

The new rule conforms more nearly with the general practice in the West.

In the Eighth District, Professor Willetts reports concerning four conferences where the transfer from a Junior college may compete at once.

In all districts, with the exception of the third, the total number of years of intercollegiate competition seems to be limited to four, the first of which is comparable with freshman participation, when freshmen are allowed to compete, but there are apparent exceptions.

A number of rules have been found desirable or necessary to cover various details in cases of transfer from Junior to Senior colleges.

Resumé

There is no generally accepted definition of a Junior college. For athletic purposes and in general, is the following satis-

factory? A Junior college is one requiring graduation from a recognized high school for admission, which has a two-year objective, does not grant a degree, and is recognized by the state in which it is situated as a Junior college, if such accrediting is practiced.

The Committee believes that it is not expedient at the present time to suggest an approach toward a common standard in accepting students who transfer from Junior colleges to degree-granting institutions and who desire to participate in inter-collegiate athletics. Difficulties will arise, particularly in N. C. A. A. championship meets, and problems of eligibility will have to be solved as best as they can until the time arrives when uniformity in practice in applying or in eliminating the residence rule is practicable.

R. L. SACKETT,
Chairman.

ADDRESSES

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

MAJOR JOHN L. GRIFFITH

This meeting brings together again many old friends and some new ones. There is something about college athletics that binds a certain type of men together. Old players travel sometimes great distances to the games. They enjoy, no doubt, watching the younger players who participate in the games, but I dare say that their greatest pleasure comes from meeting again the men with whom they played. They like to live over again the moments that meant so much to them long ago and which they have treasured in their memories.

In much the same way the men who through the years have been bound together in a common cause, and who have met annually at these N. C. A. A. meetings, enjoy the fellowship that this occasion affords.

Looking back over the months that have passed since we last met it may be of interest to review what has transpired.

Some who are still living in the memory of the age of stadium building following the War and who are thinking of the struggles which they have endured may be a bit pessimistic. I feel, however, that the depression has brought clearly to light these facts.

First, that the men who in the last twenty-five years were entrusted with the responsibility of administering college athletics performed their work well. It is significant that in these recent testing years not many weaknesses were found in the athletic structure.

Second, the survival values of college athletics are very much in evidence. Very few of the members of this association found it necessary to discontinue their intercollegiate athletic programs.

The three meets conducted by this Association were all highly successful. Two hundred and twenty-seven athletes from seventy-eight colleges and universities competed in the Thirteenth Annual Track and Field Meet that was sponsored by the University of Southern California. The gross receipts from ticket sales, \$32,398.64, represent perhaps the largest amount ever collected at a college track meet in this country.

The Swimming and Wrestling Meets sponsored and conducted by Ohio State and Michigan Universities respectively were also very gratifying. These three meets are undoubtedly serving a useful purpose. They deserve the support of all and should be continued.

So far as can be learned, as many boys competed in such sports as football, baseball, basketball, and track this year as did in 1927 and 1928. Football and basketball are for the most part self-supporting. It is estimated that the attendance at basketball

games was 10%, and in football 15%, ahead of the attendance in 1933.

While a few games each year played between teams from different conferences and sections may be desirable from the cosmopolitan standpoint, yet I am sure all are agreed that the number of intersectional games should be kept at a minimum.

Last summer the presidents of the N. C. A. A. colleges were asked what problem in athletics seemed the most pressing at the time. A few suggested that officiating at football games had come to be a serious problem. I would like to analyze this if I may. Most spectators at a football game are partisan to the extreme, and it is only natural that when an official calls a foul and penalizes the team that the partisans on one side of the field are hoping will win, these partisans feel that the official is either incompetent or unfair. Whether or not spectators at college football games are more temperate and fair-minded in their judgments than was true of spectators a quarter of a century ago, no one knows. My own feeling is that the attitudes of the students and alumni in the stands toward the officials have improved over the attitudes of the partisan spectators of an earlier day. If some progress has not been made in this respect, then we have been derelict in our duty. It has been shown time and time again that by pursuing proper educational methods the sportsmanship at this or that institution has been improved.

Viewing the matter from another angle, the officials make approximately 500 decisions in every football game, and perhaps out of 500 decisions make eight or ten mistakes. Some of the mistakes are of omission and some of commission. If a banker makes only ten mistakes out of 500 decisions he is a very successful banker. If a judge in a lower court has only ten decisions out of 500 that he has made reversed by a higher court he is a credit to the judicial fraternity. Apparently there are still some who feel that the officials should be perfect even though those who feel thus are not perfect themselves.

I believe that some progress has been made in the matter of reducing the number of mistakes made by officials in football games, and I do not feel that this is a matter that need cause this Association great concern.

Other presidents suggested that the financial problem was today the most pressing of all athletic problems. As business conditions improve the financial situation in college athletics will likewise improve. It would be fine if university presidents did not need to worry about endowments or appropriations. It would be fine if all of our athletic departments were endowed. Until such a time comes, however, it may be assumed that the college athletic departments will always have financial problems. One phase of the financial matter relates to the colleges that make the mistake of trying to play outside of their own class. Those that are content to compete year after year against near-by

friendly rivals do not need to worry about getting huge gate receipts so much as do those who may aspire for national honors.

The great majority of the presidents who were kind enough to reply to the questions asked them reported that the recruiting and subsidizing problem was the most serious one confronting the members of this Association at the moment. Recruiting has to do with the ethics of competition. We have heard in recent years a great deal about ethical codes of competition in business. Every college and university aspires to attract to its walls the best type of young men and young women. Scholastic standards and entrance requirements are continually being raised. I do not know of a single institution that limits admission to that class that is generally referred to as poor students. It might well be suggested that those in the lower brackets intellectually have more need of an education than those in the higher brackets, but educationally we still believe that superiority is more to be desired than mediocrity or inferiority.

In the same way those who like to see their teams do well in athletics are more apt to manifest interest in prospective college students who are of the athletic type than they are in those who are not interested in athletics. The alumnus then who is interested in athletics may be accused of singing the praises of his institution only to high school boys who are also interested in athletics.

The serious aspects of this matter of competition for athletes are the following: first, some institutions send out field agents to recruit only athletes and, second, as a means of inducing promising athletes to enter this or that institution subsidies are offered.

I do not feel that an athlete should not be entitled to receive a scholarship or help from employment bureaus because he is an athlete, but when athletic scholarships are offered athletes solely on the basis of their athletic ability, when loan funds are maintained solely for the benefit of athletes, and when employment bureaus are operated to assist only deserving athletes, then subsidization sets in. For the sake of equal competition, if for no other reason, institutions that do not subsidize their athletes in any form whatsoever will ultimately be forced to schedule games only with institutions of similar ideals and aims. This Association by educational methods has through the years exerted an influence in favor of amateur athletics and thus has frowned on the short cut methods that some institutions have adopted in the hopes of attaining success.

The easy way to solve this problem would be to abolish inter-collegiate athletics. Such, however, is a cowardly method and one that never achieves success if the aims of those who espouse it are to make men honest.

Another method that many propose consists of asking this Association to assume the responsibility of policing college ath-

letics throughout the country. The college that does not possess enough fortitude and character to administer its athletics honestly would like to pass the responsibility on to some national body. In the last analysis, however, I am sure that athletic standards must be maintained and enforced by small groups of homogeneous institutions that are accustomed to meet frequently on the athletic fields.

When the human race has progressed, it has been through the slow, painful, and tedious process of education and religion. We cannot make men good in athletics by legislation nor by giving some national body police powers. For more than a quarter of a century we have operated as an educational body. I trust that the time will never come when we will admit our inability to govern ourselves and consequently ask this organization to assume dictatorial powers.

The pacifists would outlaw war. Others would outlaw sin and crime and disease. We may attempt to outlaw illegitimate recruiting and subsidizing, but in the end we will find our efforts unavailing. The solution lies in the minds and hearts of the men at the head of our institutions and at the head of our athletic departments.

I have been trying to understand just what the men who have come to these meetings year after year and who have given of their time in the interests of college athletics have accomplished. In other words, what is the value of the National Collegiate Athletic Association? You men have believed in athletics or you would not have worked as you have worked to preserve the games of youth.

You have constantly been placed on the defensive by those who do not believe that athletics have a place in the educational scheme. There are many diverse opinions regarding this question, the reason being that there are many diverse opinions regarding the meaning of education and the function of a college. I dare say if each man in this room were asked to give his idea of the meaning of life, the purpose of life, or what constitutes success in life, that we would get almost as many definitions as there are men here. This being true, quite naturally men will not agree regarding the proper definition of education. Those to whom the purpose of a college and the function of education mean one thing quite naturally feel that athletics is not a part of their scheme of education.

You men must have a different definition of education, and you must believe that athletics have some kind of a place in the pedagogical scheme, otherwise you as educators would not give your attention to this matter as you have given it.

It is not my purpose to defend the modern concept of education as opposed to the old traditional idea of education, but may I in passing observe that those who accept the modern viewpoint are each year increasing in numbers.

Further, you who believe in competition are constantly finding yourselves in conflict with those who do not believe in competition. Mark Sullivan has pointed out that "human beings are divided by nature into individualists and collectivists, into those who like independence and those who prefer supervision, between those who like the open field and the competitive games and those who prefer the cloistered walls and the security to be found therein." Those who are apostles of the easy life abhor strife and competitive struggle. The others realize that "energy is evolved only in overcoming obstacles, that a vigorous combat with evil develops the individual, and that a state from which ambition is banished to leave the citizens free from difficulties is a state in which moral vigor decays and social stagnation as a living tomb swallows up the proudest progress of the march of minds." Athletics are highly competitive. I know of no other human activity in which men strive so hard for victory as do the men who compete on the college football teams, and yet, may I add, I know of no other competitive field than football or our other college games in which men striving to the limit of their capacity for victory still observe the niceties of competition, respect the rights of their opponents, and observe the rules of the game.

There are some who would have us believe that if the prize is great men will be more prone to cheat in trying to achieve the prize than they would if the goal was less desirable. I feel certain that in college athletics we have fully demonstrated the falsity of this theory.

Human nature is not perfect, and consequently our college athletics are not perfect. Condemning institutions and systems is a popular pastime at the moment. The men of this Association have never made the mistake of thinking of college athletics as an institution. They realize that athletics in a given institution are just as good or as bad as the men who are responsible for the administration of athletics in that institution.

It has been a great pleasure indeed to have served and fraternized with you men through the very happy years that have passed. I know that college athletics are safe in your hands, and I wish you Godspeed in the splendid work that you are doing.

THE NEWSPAPER AND COLLEGE SPORTS

ROBERT F. KELLEY, SPORTS EDITOR, *New York Times*

When I first received the suggestion from one whom I had in the past considered as my friend, Bill Bingham of Harvard, that I make a speech at the convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, I began casting about in the back of my memory to see if I could think of any time when the N. C. A. A. as a body, or any of its officials as individuals, had done anything to arouse the spirit of revenge in the breast of the gentleman from the banks of the Charles. I indulged in some discreet questioning of those known to Mr. Bingham with a view to discovering whether he enjoyed a reputation as a practical joker. Finally I sent a cautious reply to his first note, explaining that I had no very richly endowed opinion of myself as a talker, and no idea whatsoever of what to say.

That, gentlemen, for your future guidance, is a mistake when dealing with Mr. Bingham. By return mail I received a genial little missive telling me he was delighted that I had accepted the invitation, and that it would be all right to go ahead and talk about anything.

So here at the outset, before bitterness sets in for any of you patient, I hope, listeners, let me set the blame where it belongs. The presence of football coaches in considerable number makes me doubly nervous. If any of you develop an uncontrollable desire for physical revenge, let me point out definitely the source of irritation. He will be, in all probability, smiling, and, unless it has finally worn out, he will be wearing a crimson and black knitted necktie.

Seriously, of course, it is a most distinctly appreciated compliment to my profession to be asked to be present here in this meeting in something more than the role of strictly neutral bystander which has been my calling for some years. The fact that I was a newspaperman increased my original wonder at being invited here. The conventions of the N. C. A. A. have been for a number of years clearing houses for people with ideas of what should be done about this or that thing, usually some evil thing. By training as a supposedly detached observer I am disqualified to offer any plans, and by instinct I am a poor viewer with alarm.

It has seemed to me the best justification for my presence would be an attempt to give to you gentlemen some impressions of college sport as they have come to newspapermen in general and sports writers in particular during the past few years; to attempt to outline to you some problems which we have in dealing with these affairs; and, perhaps, to slide in a personal observation or two.

I have spent an appalling lot of time beating the keys of typewriters; so much so that I am a cripple when I try to talk rather than write. In an effort to prevent as much suffering as possible on your part I have sort of combined things here. I have written out a few ideas and beg your indulgence if I read them, rather than attempt to make a speech of it.

In any discussion it is well to establish at the outset a frank and intelligent basis of understanding. There has been, and still is in some quarters, a feeling against publicity in connection with college sports. In other quarters the feeling against publicity has not been quite so strongly held. But even in those points where it is apparently not desired it has come. And it will continue to come, unless gates are locked against the public.

It would seem, then, intelligent to recognize this fact. Open and calm acceptance of the reality that newspapers will publish a good deal of material about your college and its teams will do much to destroy the nightmare of publicity evils. A thing is never so fearsome in the light as it is in the dark. It might even help to realize frankly and calmly that in college sport, as it is constituted at present—that is, where gate receipts are a necessity, and I don't believe automatically an evil—publicity is welcomed and needed by colleges. Obviously it is needed by newspapers. It should follow, then, that coöperation of the friendliest and best sort should exist between the two.

I wonder if all of you realize the physical difficulties which confront a newspaperman in his work. At the risk of boring you I am going to detail some of them. Someone has once said there is nothing so dead as yesterday's newspaper. Speed, the moment, is all important in the newspaper business. When I, or any of my friends, go out to cover a sports event, speed is the first thing in mind. Where an afternoon paper is concerned, the reason for this is self evident. The afternoon man has to sit at a game and, as it unfolds in front of his eyes, dictate to a telegrapher alongside him instantly the play as it happens. He cannot afford to spend time in thinking about polished phrases, or do anything but keep abreast of the game. If he falls back for any time at all he is overwhelmed and lost.

The newspaperman goes to the game, weighted down with typewriters, field glasses, charts, pencils, papers, and good intentions. He usually has to stand up on the special train; he is in the midst of a excited mob of people, all of whom are on holiday, and he is in the thick of deep, noisy excitement. He hangs to the edge of a trolley car or he barbers with a bandit in back of a taxi wheel to get to the scene of action. More often he walks a tremendous distance, banging bags into the knees of indignant paying customers.

In the midst of all this confusion he has to keep an orderly and concentrated mind. During the course of play he has to watch with the intensity of a chemist observing an experiment.

He must have something of a photographic mind, for it is impossible to make notes of everything. Then, when it is all over and the crowds depart to talk it over and decide on points wherein to disagree with the newspaper accounts, he stays behind. In the hour immediately following that game he has to fashion a composed, complete, and, so far as humanly possible, accurate account of what has taken place. Ushers and sweepers-up finish their jobs and disappear, until finally only the reporters and the telegraphers are left. It is usually a couple of hours after a game that we are finished, and if any of you need for any reason a glimpse of complete desolation and loneliness I give you a big stadium in the dark of early evening an hour after a game has taken place.

Some of you may wonder why a morning paper story, which does not reach you until breakfast, needs to be done in such a hurry. Well, your game is only one of a hundred that are being handled. And that paper which reaches you at breakfast Sunday morning has been put to bed by ten o'clock—in some instances before then—the night before, rushed through city streets to trains, and shipped away.

That is the outside picture of covering a game. Inside the newspaper office there are the problems of taking these thousands of words as they come into the office, reading every one of them to guard against mistakes of any kind, writing heads on them, and getting them into the form. To my mind, it is a wonder that more inaccuracies do not appear than are discovered when the paper finally reaches the street.

It is, of course, the ideal of newspaper making to be right, to avoid mistakes. Mistakes are irritating to you whom they offend and to ourselves when we make them. One of the surest ways of guarding against them is to accept frankly the presence of newspapermen, to accept the reason for that presence, and to do everything you reasonably can to help the newspaper man when he visits you.

For that reason in recent years there has appeared in college life various gentlemen known as public relation counsels, directors of information, and by various other titles. They are, to a certain extent, press agents. Their value to the newspapers, and, to far more of an extent, to the colleges themselves depends on the extent to which they are press agents. A bad press agent is the worst thing a college may have, and, in relation, a bad thing for college sport in general. By a bad press agent I mean one who tries to create space by absurd means, the invention of bloody nicknames and reports and the rest of it. It doesn't have to be described to you. A good press agent recognizes that his college can benefit by correct information about its activities, and goes, efficiently and without fanfare, about the task of doing that.

Such men as Frank Ryan at Harvard, Fred Osborne at Prince-

ton, Paul Barnett at Yale, Lt. Pat. Echols at West Point, Bob Harron at Columbia—and their number is, fortunately, increasing, there are many others,—do the colleges they represent real service, do newspapers real service, and, I believe, do college sport real service.

It has frequently been the fashion to blame newspapers and newspapermen for the evils, real or fancied, of college sport. Well, that means football. For it is football which is the only real problem that college sport presents in the way of control. Wild and unprincipled newspaper writing is blamed for this. It would be absurd for me to deny that I have offended at times in this respect, or to claim that my colleagues have not offended at times. But I think it is equally absurd to burden newspapers with the major share of what there is of blame.

I think this instinct on the part of some of you is due to a slightly mistaken idea of newspaper work. It is necessary to remind yourselves that newspapers do not create situations. We describe them to the best of our ability, but we do not make them. Football is overwritten, perhaps, in the newspapers. There are a dozen reasons for this. For one, there is the fact that practically no other sport of any importance is under way at the time of college football. This, very probably, leads to too many words in an effort to have something to say.

But there is too much football in papers—if that is granted—chiefly because there is too much interest in the game, and, for some reason, there is more frenzy connected with it than any other sport, certainly, in which the American indulges, and more frenzy almost than in any other activity. I wish you could see some of the letters—we have two to one on football to any other sport—that come into newspaper offices during the football season. We may be pardoned if we feel at times that the only thing followers of football desire is praise or silence, and they don't enjoy the silence very much.

I remember one Army-Notre Dame game played in bitter cold weather in New York, which I covered. A couple of days later a letter, without signature and without salutation, arrived for me. In magnificently phrased paragraphs it took apart all pretensions I might have on my ancestry and my religion, despite the fact that I am a dog lover and my father's people came from the south of Ireland. A few days later I ran into an Army officer of my acquaintance. I showed him the letter. He shook his head and said, "Well, I don't think you gave Army all it had coming to it in that game." There are times when we feel we cannot possibly win.

My friend George Daley, sports editor of the *Herald-Tribune*, in discussing this talk with me the other day, told me of an experience of his this year. When a certain college finished its season with definite improvement, George thought it would be

nice, and certainly merited, to say something about it in his column. Unfortunately the same paragraph included reference to two teams of smaller colleges which also had fine teams. George received eight letters blasting him for daring to bracket the first college with these little fellows.

This sort of thing may be, and probably is in great measure, the result of overwriting football games in particular and all college sports in general. By overwriting, I mean describing the Fall of Rome, illuminated by skyrockets, rather than a football game. Well, this makes entertaining reading, and it makes popular reading, and perhaps some of the fault lies in the fact that the readers accept it at face value.

In time I think this can be cured by a combination of more studious writing and more studious reading. I mean by this, that games may be described more technically, and as games rather than spectacles, and that the average watcher and reader may arrive at the point where he will know a game well enough to enjoy that type of account. British sport writing is very much on this level, and sport is considerably older there than here.

It will take time for this, but it is beginning to come now, and when it finally arrives many of the evils of the other type will be lost. One of the things that must be accomplished first, however, is the willingness to allow criticism of college players for mechanical shortcomings and of teams on the same plane. Before this can be done there must be a realization that, because a boy may not block on a certain assignment, it does not necessarily follow that he is to be shunned as one with the plague. I am trying to head toward the idea that these things can be done only when the time comes that newspaper discussion is more naturally regarded by all hands, and not looked upon as some sort of black magic.

In the face of reported discouragement on the part of several prominent personages in college sport where the question of professionalism, by that or any other name is concerned, it will seem strange for me to say that I believe, and that, I think, many of my colleagues believe things to be definitely on a better grade than they have been.

We would all be fools if we denied the presence of professionalism and its presence in too large proportions. But, I think, there is very real evidence that the thing will cure itself in time. One mistake, I think, made by those who indulge in the expensive business of importing and maintaining players is that they work on the principle of providing the best, mechanically, in the way of football players. The end to be attained is gate receipts. It is my feeling that this business is putting the oats on the pole in front of the donkey's nose. What crowds will come to see in football, I believe, is a good game. A good game is one between evenly matched teams. If

you all played the same type of men the evenly matched games would still be there and they'd be a great deal less expensive. In time I think this will be self evident, for already it is possible to find places where slightly professionalized teams have fallen off in attendance and teams that are not so, but have played even, interesting games, have gained.

And I don't see much hope for a cure in regulation and organization carried out to a high degree. Rules and laws can always be twisted and defeated. The worst thing in the present situation is hypocrisy. More rules and laws would mean more of that.

In this regard I am reminded of one of those childhood experiences which stick in your mind long after you've grown up. I complained to my father once that, on a certain route to school, I was constantly set upon by a somewhat uncouth and much tougher boy. My father asked me, very simply, if it was necessary for me to go to school that way. "Why," he said, "if you don't like the boy do you go near him?" There didn't seem to be any answer to that. It would seem to me that most problems could be settled by simply not playing with the fellow you do not like instead of trying to change him. By that is none of my business. I apologize for yielding to the glowing temptation of telling the other fellow what to do.

Newspapermen are described as hard boiled cynics. Well, I don't know. If I see many more movies of newspaper life perhaps I'll feel that way myself. I would describe newspapermen another way. Borrowing an expression of Christopher Morley I'd say we were "cheerfully disenchanted." We are not able to hang on to many illusions. On the other hand, we can find things to take their place. And we are not hard boiled.

I believe, quite firmly, that those of us who write sport and spend so much of our lives about colleges feel as strongly as you gentlemen that the thing is tremendously worth while, that it has real and vital importance in the world. And I say to you most earnestly that we want to do everything in our power to help preserve and carry on a thing which all of us feel, whether we joke about it at times or not, forms a strong, living, and, if you will understand what I mean, beautiful part of American life.

THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF FOOTBALL

DANA X. BIBLE, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

A distinct honor falls to my lot today in that I am privileged to represent the American Football Coaches Association before this large group of university representatives.

Throughout the years, football has been closely associated with university life, and we who are in direct contact with the boys who play the game and the men who lay down the rules of eligibility feel that football has a definite part in a well-balanced program of any American university or college.

The formation of the American Football Coaches Association came as a result of the foresight and enthusiasm of Major Charles D. Daly, prominent coach and past gridiron star. He called the first meeting by inviting friends to meet with him here in this city to discuss the feasibility of organizing an association which would bring together the college football coaches of the country for the common good and improvement of the game.

That meeting was held in December 1921, at which time, with the approval of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, formal organization was perfected, and in behalf of our group I wish at this time to express appreciation of the recognition extended then by the N. C. A. A. and of the helpful advice with which that organization has since assisted us in our progress.

The object of the Coaches Association may be outlined thus: to help maintain the highest possible standards in football and the football coaching profession; to discuss matters of mutual interest; to submit to the proper organization suggestions for the improvement of football; and to place at the disposal of coaches sources of football formation.

I have taken your time with this brief historical digest in order that you may know the purpose of our organization and the goal toward which we strive.

The presence of a football coach at a meeting of this nature—an honor which I assure you the coach in question greatly appreciates—would seem to imply that football, like your respective specialties, is an activity which has a certain value in enriching the experience and increasing the social usefulness of young men. If I interpret the signs aright, it means that you gentlemen, as representatives of educational institutions, are alive to the educational values in competitive athletics, and that you recognize the important part they play in the school's function of making boys into men. Many coaches are sincere in the faith that a well-rounded program of physical training and athletics has useful things to offer both to him who participates and to him who watches from the grandstand, and this faith inspires

these coaches to hope that our profession may soon come to be considered a department of education, with the dignity and stability proper to such a status.

It is true that the great development of athletics in the last twenty-five years has proceeded along the line which lies outside the bounds of a regular curriculum. This spontaneous and irregular origin has brought with it some disadvantages. In the first place, the athletic program in many cases has assumed such importance in school life that it has not been satisfactorily adjusted to the academic welfare of the school. In the second place, the fact that coaching has had no recognized educational status has made the profession a precarious one, and has almost forced coaches, especially young men with their futures before them, to neglect every other consideration in a desperate attempt to win games, and therefore establish their reputations. Finally, the extra-curricular character of sports has allowed coaches to yield to the professional temptation of confining their attention to the boys who are already best developed athletically, thus restricting athletic training to those who need it least. These three conditions, all results of the irregular evolution of athletics, constitute, from an educational point of view, grounds for indictment of school athletics in general. It may be said in reply, however, that the coöperation of the faculty in athletic councils is, to some extent at least, removing the conflict between athletic departments and academic interests; that year by year more coaches are seeking to establish their calling as a profession and a department of education; that the great and growing development of intramural sports is rapidly removing the grounds for the statement that athletics chiefly help those who least need help. It cannot be claimed that any of these features which make football objectionable as a part of the educational system has been wholly counteracted; but at least they have been recognized as problems by the leaders in the coaching profession, and we may therefore hope to see them lessened with time.

But the irregular and spontaneous growth of sport has also given this activity at least one positive virtue, one great advantage over other departments of education. Whatever you gentlemen may think of the educational value of football, you can certainly not deny the genuineness and vigor of the students' enthusiasm for it. The coach has at his command an inexhaustible fountain of unaffected zest and ardor which may well arouse the envy of the teacher of English or history, who considers himself lucky if, by bringing to bear the most consummate skill, learning, and devotion, he succeeds in arousing one-tenth the interest displayed by the most languid candidate for a football team. Surely this boundless energy and interest placed at the coach's disposal places upon him a heavy responsibility, and offers him a magnificent educational opportunity. Modern educational theory emphasizes the importance of making a student

feel that the assignment is something which he is not forced but privileged to engage in. This state of mind, obtained in the classroom only by the instructor's intense effort, is merely normal on the football field. It is to be expected, therefore, that whatever of value football has to teach the youngster will inevitably get home to him.

And this leads to the central question. What is there of educational value that football has to teach? Without venturing upon what would be in this gathering a highly dangerous attempt to define educational values, it seems to me that the late President Theodore Roosevelt summed the matter up correctly when, in speaking of education for a growing boy, he said: "What we have a right to expect from the American boy is that he shall turn out to be a good American man. Now the chances are that he won't be much of a man unless he is a good deal of a boy. He must not be a coward, a weakling, a bully, a shirk, or a prig. He must work hard and play hard. He must be clean minded and clean lived, and be able to hold his own under all circumstances and against all comers. In life as in a football game, the principle to follow is: Hit the line hard; don't foul and don't shirk, but hit the line hard."

The average American father is not looking for a personally conducted tour through life for his son. He doesn't want him to be led by the hand or fed from a spoon, and therefore nothing is more important than that a boy should learn during his formative years to control and command his own powers; to focus them upon a single end; to mobilize them quickly and completely; to think fast and realistically; to disregard pain and risk in pursuit of a desired end; to subordinate his interests to the interests of the group; to coordinate his activity with the activity of others engaged in the same task; to call up and expend in an emergency his last reserves of strength and courage; to pour out all of his energy in furious effort, observing at the same time a chivalrous regard for the rights of others, the rules of the game, and the limits dictated by decency and sportsmanship. Football not only teaches him the will to win and the way to win, but it teaches him something else. It teaches him how to meet defeat. When he is defeated what is his attitude? Does he curl up and quit? Does he whine? Does he attack the sportsmanship and ability of his opponent? Or does he keep his chest out, his head up, with clear eyes and self-respect; and in defeat is he able to stand by the side of the road and cheer as the victor goes by, while underneath it all his spirit re-echoes the words of the old Scotchman wounded in battle:

"Fight on, my men," Sir Andrew said.

"A little I am hurt but not quite slain,
I will just lie down and bleed awhile,
And then I will rise and fight again."

This is a training, it seems to me, that lies at the heart of the development of an individual toward good and useful citizenship.

Now it is possible in the classroom to preach all this to a boy, to show him the need and importance of it, but it is vital and imperative that he should have a laboratory training in carrying out the precepts given him. Football furnishes such a laboratory.

Like any other program, however, proper leadership is essential if we are to get the full value from it. The duty of the coach, it seems to me, is to make these habits a part of the current ideal of every student. In order to do this he must drive himself and his teams. There must be no affectation about not caring for victory. He must care for victory and fight for it hard and cleanly. He must seek to make the game a thrilling exhibition of skill, cleverness, daring, and finished technique, but in all his ambition to win he must never forget that victory is a means and not an end; that fundamentally his duty is to make sound, keen, decent men.

I have tried today to avoid empty phrases and to speak realistically of our profession. In closing, I should like to urge that you continue to be friendly, critically friendly, if you like, in helping the coaches to make football play a valuable part in the molding of good human beings.

WHAT SHOULD THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETIC
DEPARTMENTS CONTRIBUTE TO THE EDUCATION
OF COLLEGE YOUTH?

DEAN HERBERT E. HAWKES, COLUMBIA COLLEGE

In looking over the program for these meetings, I notice that the discussion is for the most part either technical, or at least specific in its relation to some particular field of the physical side of our make up. The papers go all the way from very general treatments of the Nature of Medical Organization, to the rules for Touch Football, and the technique of the Huddle and Shift. So far as I can see, this arrangement gives me an opportunity to say a few words from a point of view a little removed from the actual departmental job, and to attempt at any rate to see just where the professional work of this group fits into the educational picture which we are all trying to paint.

At no more remote time in the past than I can myself recall, the whole aim of college education, in the minds of most of the professors, was the acquisition of knowledge and the inspiration to go after more knowledge gained from books or from their lectures. The whole emphasis was placed on intellectual education. Well do I recall talking with some of the wise men of the old guard of that day and expressing the hope that some time a way would be found to include the great fields of the fine arts and music in the scheme of college education. I scarcely lived to tell the tale. Such topics were not subject matters, and had no rights that deserved any consideration at all in a college curriculum. If this situation was true regarding music and art, how much more was it true regarding any attention to physical education. The time, the energy that students devoted to their games and body building was regarded by this old guard as directly subversive of the objects of the college as an educational institution. All this was one of the weaknesses of the flesh, due to the shameful fact that we all have bodies to which we are tied rather closely, but which we ought not to take too seriously. I have often wondered whether this antipathy toward any normal attention to health and the body was due to the old theological attitude of despising the body and mortifying the flesh, in order that the spirit might shine forth more clearly.

However it came about, and notwithstanding the intrenched position of the members of some of the old departments of study who watched with jealous eye every minute of time on the schedule of the students that was given over to any other subjects than their own, something did take place. You probably know the details of the growth of the movement in more detail than I do. I have an idea that my old friend, Dr. Anderson,

of Yale, had some hand in certain features of this movement. But however it came about, it did come to pass that both the school and the college now look upon their job, not as merely training the intellectual faculties but as cultivating the entire personality of the youth whom they serve. I think that most of us realize that the motive power that makes the world go round is more in the emotions than is the intellect, and that for either a clear and sound mind, or for balanced and stable emotions a sound body in good health, is required. If this is true, the educator is driven to one of two positions. If he is really to play any intelligent part in the education of youth, he must either attempt to blend into one educative whole the three elements of mind, body, and spirit, or else treat them in separate institutions for the training of these three aspects of the same individual. It is, of course, quite silly even to mention such an alternative except in schools for teacher training, or advanced work. So, as a matter of development, we have arrived at the point where we at least recognize the importance of these three fields, and our responsibility for including them in our plan of education, a plan which has been realized in many of our colleges and schools.

When one observes the way collegiate education was approached fifty years ago, with the entire emphasis placed on the purely intellectual side of the problem, one is confronted with the undoubted fact that many of the graduates of the colleges of that day were cultured gentlemen who rightly claim that the product of those days was of higher order than the average today. Although there is no way of reaching any valid comparison, and although the older graduate who presents this argument usually has in mind the finest flower of that system as set against one of the present crop of graduates of whom no one is particularly proud, the fact remains that probably the average graduate of the eighties and nineties comes nearer to the ideal of what we would like to think the college graduate ought to be than the run of graduates today. But we must never forget that the boy who went to college then was highly selected, and comprised only a negligible percentage of the boys of college age. It is safe to say that ten times as large a percentage of our present population enters college as did at that time, with the inevitable lowering of the average of cultural background of purely intellectual interests and knowledge of subjects that comprised the course of study at that time. Sad as this may be, there can be no doubt, however, that the education of today, which is aimed at the whole boy, is infinitely more suited to our present conditions than the older approach.

The point of my remarks up to the present is contained in the statement that, whereas formerly we were attempting to train only the intellectual aspect of the individual, now we try to reach the whole personality,—mind, body, and spirit. But how are we to do it? There are two contrasted theories as to the best man-

ner of approaching this problem. One method rests on the assumption that individual differences are the point of departure in education. It emphasizes the fact that we are all a little different from each other, and that on account of these differences all education should be adapted to the individual temperament, ability, and ambition of each boy or girl. The fundamental on which the other approach rests is the fact that after all we are alike in many respects, and that there is, and must be, a common core to any education that is offered by schools or colleges. To be sure, individual differences exist, but according to this second theory these differences can be taken care of in connection with, and as a modification of, the common core.

The first principle is the one that lies at the basis of the new and exceedingly interesting advances which are being made at places like Bennington and Goucher Colleges. Not only do they find out all that they possibly can about each student who registers, but the curriculum for each is planned almost entirely as an individual matter. It goes without saying that by this method many students are found who need the same treatment in their first year or two of college residence, and consequently classes are formed for the presentation of the material that any considerable number may require. This is an absorbingly interesting method of proceeding, and I am certain that under wise direction excellent results will be attained. It ought to be mentioned, however, that with our present techniques for finding out just what kind of persons, in mind, body, and spirit, our students really are, there is considerable room for error. We do not have tests which are searching and accurate enough to burrow as deeply into the personality of boys and girls as is often necessary to settle all of the questions that ought to be clear if this method is to achieve perfect results. Furthermore, this method emphasizes the eccentricities of the individual to the point of encouraging them, unless carried out with the greatest wisdom. Unless almost miraculous care is taken, the tendency is to make a person proud of his peculiarities, and to make him tend toward a less coöperative, a less tolerant, and a less understanding attitude toward the personalities that differ from his own. Heaven knows that today there are plenty of centrifugal forces at work in our land, intellectual, social, religious, moral, and emotional, which tend to throw people apart. What we most need is greater, rather than less, attention paid to mutual understanding, and to playing the game with one's fellows. In so far as this manner of approaching our common job is centrifugal, insofar as it throws people away from each other, it is unwise. This centrifugal result of the individualistic approach to education is not inevitable, but it is certainly a danger.

The second method of attack of our common responsibility rests on the belief that, after all, we are a good deal alike, and that the community of interests looms larger in the lives of each

of us than the divergence. By this principle one assumes that, unless the contrary is indicated, all students should do certain things together, take certain prescribed courses, observe certain regulations, and conform to certain norms of conduct. Under this plan one finds requirements which must be satisfied by all, unless that requirement is waived for a reason which follows from some known individual difference which makes the particular student a special case. I do not know whether at the present time most colleges frame the requirements for their degrees for this reason, but at any rate it is a logical reason for some common requirement. This method, too, has its danger. Unless administered with wisdom, it forces every one into exactly the same mould, regardless of their personal abilities and temperaments. Unless this plan is carried out with flexibility, allowing the requirements to be forgotten for anyone for whom they do more harm than good, the fact of individual differences is given less weight than it deserves.

It may be true that, administered wisely, these two schemes of education would not differ much from each other in the final result. One starts with individual differences, and combines individuals whose needs are alike; the other starts with the tentative assumption that all are alike, and makes allowance for individual differences. The fact remains, however, that the emphasis in the two plans is quite distinct in the initial stage. It is very likely that one method would be better for some boys, and the other method better for others. It is not easy to be certain.

What does all this have to do with the departments of physical education, and the health service, and the coaches of our athletic teams? I think that you know without my saying any more about it, but just to relieve my mind I want to say a few words that seem to me important regarding the way in which your technical job fits in with these divergent ideas of education.

I do not need to tell this audience that there is no substitute for good health and a sound body. Peace of mind, capacity to do anything worth doing, and comfort both for one's self and one's associates depend almost absolutely upon it. It is so important that no college has any business to admit a student and spend the large portion of funds from its endowment that it must needs contribute to the education of every student over and above his tuition charges unless he is in sufficiently good health to improve the opportunity offered to him. Any other procedure is the misappropriation of trust funds, and much more besides. Not only that, but the college has the right, and, I believe, the obligation to require each student to eliminate any remediable physical defect or condition which lowers his vitality or prevents satisfactory accomplishment. Bad tonsils are almost as serious a handicap to college success as a dumb mind. In fact, they frequently caused the dumb mind.

Not only impairment of physical health must be detected and

so far as possible remedied, but, often more important, the mental health should be the object of concern. Whether the best plan is to have a psychiatrist on the ground, or to make certain that the college doctor is very alert in this field of his work, depends a good deal on local conditions. But as I see an increasing number of boys, I am more and more impressed with the fact that mental health is just as likely to be impaired as physical, and much more difficult to diagnose and treat. I am certain that everyone in this room knows this fact as well or better than I do.

But now to come down to a little detail about our every day job. In what way can a college course in hygiene, for example, best serve the school or the college? I think that the two principles mentioned earlier, individual differences and group work, both enter into the answer to this question. There is a body of factual material regarding both public and personal hygiene that is not individual at all. It is general information. Our anatomy is not subject to much individual differences, nor our normal physiology. There are the same kinds of vitamins in foods for all of us. There is a considerable body of fact and suggestion that applies to every person. And there is no good reason for presenting all of this work individually. But after this has been said, the fact remains that many of the matters that concern one's individual health and happiness are intensely his own. Each individual has his own digestion, his own problems of how and when to do his work so as to make everything fit together, his own problem of diet, of fatigue, and of sex. I do not think that this most important question of sex can possibly be treated in public, with anything like the helpfulness that is necessary if we are to do our jobs as they should be done. Personal conference is absolutely required, and the important individual differences, real or imagined, must be discussed privately. Consequently, it seems that this important subject of hygiene must consciously employ both methods in order to be well done.

Almost the same thing can be said regarding the usual work in body building, or physical education. Class work, or common games and enterprises for groups, must be organized, but with the eye always open for the boy who is not game conscious, or is over game conscious, and for all of the other varieties of youth that you are all familiar with.

And now I come to the most important aspect of the whole matter as far as the persons here assembled are concerned. If we are to train the whole boy, and if the work represented by this group lies at the basis of everything that all the rest of us may attempt, it is of superlative importance that you should yourselves have a sense of unity and a common attitude toward these boys and girls in our schools and college. No one in the entire list of college officers, instructors, professors, deans, or presidents, begins to have the opportunity to learn and to influence the attitude and fundamentals of living that are current

among students as do the athletic coaches and the teacher of hygiene and physical education and the college doctor. If you yourselves have the quality to do it, your opportunity is boundless. I would rather have an athletic coach of the right kind than almost any other officer of the college. Or perhaps it would be more forcible and no less true to say that an unwholesome athletic coach or teacher of health education can do more harm than almost anyone else.

For two reasons this is important. Since we agree that the whole boy must be trained, your work is absolutely essential in bringing to the surface in each boy with whom you come in contact the qualities of mind and character that your speciality naturally evokes. Each of you knows what that is. The games of baseball, of basketball, of football, of tennis, each and all have contributions to this training of the whole man. But this is not all. You are each a member of a staff of teachers, of history and chemistry and all of the rest. In common with them you learn your men. The information that you gain about your squads ought to be a part of the personnel record of every student that you meet. And unless your institutions realize the fact that you are in a strategic position in this personnel enterprise, they are missing half of the contribution that you can render to them. If the idea of individual differences means anything, and it is probably the most important idea that has entered education in the last hundred years, we must break down these foolish and artificial boundaries between the subject matter departments, and give the boy a chance to be known and to be educated with his fellows in an intelligent manner. The only way under the heavens of bringing this about is for this group to feel, and to be given the chance to exercise, its great and unique opportunity to know their students and to pass that knowledge along to the point where it can be of appropriate influence in the educative process.

THE PLACE OF THE COLLEGE PHYSICIAN IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

DEAN FRASER METZGER, RUTGERS COLLEGE

This paper is submitted to this convention in perfect frankness. Whatever may appear in the nature of adverse criticism is not to be interpreted as the unfriendly judgment of a dean of men. That remark is made because of my keen appreciation of the fact that in probably no group or environment in all the world does there exist so little recognition of the virtue of attending to one's own business as on a college campus.

In the spirit of good fellowship, permit me to acknowledge the part played by the college physician. His services in the care of the health of our students are invaluable. The development of infirmaries and hospitals at our college centers is to the credit of the men who have served in the capacity of college physicians. The growing interest in a program of education in hygiene that is resulting in the prevention of disease and a far healthier student body is the result of the successful work of the men who have served as doctors to our students.

Without more ado, and because the time element of this paper permits of few frills and fancies, I want to start out by saying that the college doctor is not and can not be an independent unit on a college campus.

The task of the college physician is of such an important nature as to make him an integral part of the whole educational system, and by virtue of that fact calls for the fullest possible coöperation with the entire faculty, and particularly with those of us engaged in personnel work. Certain information comes to the college physician that is invaluable to the man who must deal with the so-called problem student. This does not apply only to the student who is failing in his scholastic work; it prevails almost as often with the bright student who is suffering from some affliction that leads not infrequently to social maladjustments. It is our duty to see to it that these students receive such assistance as careful diagnosis and wise treatment will make available. Viewed from the standpoint of the dean's office, the doctor's recommendations would be an invaluable aid, and I am firmly of the opinion that the college physician should submit his recommendations even when unsolicited. No professional obligations or undue modesty should act as a deterrent in this vital service.

Such correlation of the work connected with student welfare is sure to bring about desirable results. This coöperation is by no means confined to an administrative office such as that of the dean. It applies with equal force to other departments, particu-

larly that of the department of physical education. It is not a little gratifying to note that physical education is more and more finding its proper sphere. The emphasis on corrective exercise, the stress laid on the value of physical training for the entire student body, the opportunities offered to every student for adequate play and recreation, the breaking down of undue emphasis on athletic prowess are developments that offer the student health department an unprecedented opportunity to contribute to a sane and wholesome program of physical education and training that will result in stronger college men who will graduate to another level of action better equipped to carry the burdens that are sure to fall on their shoulders.

In carrying out this program, certain definite and concrete plans are worthy of consideration. The first to be mentioned is delicate in its nature, and calls clearly for the spirit of tactful coöperation already mentioned. I would welcome the day when the college physician and his staff should supervise the training of the athletes. This does not imply administration of the athletic department, nor technical training in football or any other sport, but it does mean such supervision as would direct each student engaged in athletics toward a healthy program that will develop a strong, vigorous body reasonably assured of a longevity expectancy, instead of a burned-out four-letter man.

The second is a sanitary survey of the living quarters of the students. In most colleges the dormitory quarters are well supervised, but there are conditions in many boarding houses, and even in some fraternities, that are far from livable. A survey conducted by the student health department would make available recommendations and data that would help to eliminate the menace to health that now prevails.

The third is a well conducted course in hygiene, carrying college credit. It will mean as much to students to be informed concerning their physical functions and the proper care of this temple of the soul as it will for them to be well informed in any field of science, philosophy, or history. Much is to be said for the scholar, but that scholar must live in a world which calls for endurance and inflicts hardships with which only a strong man can cope.

Such a course should not be involved with the existing practice of a weekly lecture by the college physician. I believe that most of you will concur in my opinion that the lecture custom is more or less of a farce and should be abandoned without delay. The course should be of the nature of any other scientific course. It should be a course involving hard work along constructive lines, instead of cursory comments embodied in an hour's lecture.

Other suggestions come to mind, but the time allotted for this discussion is limited, and I must speak of what I consider the most important function of the college doctor, as well as of every other officer or teacher in our universities.

The college physician is one of a faculty assembled for the purpose of training the youth who come under tutelage in any particular college or university. That statement has in it something of much wider meaning than would be involved in saying that a college physician is a man who has the responsibility for treatment of any physical ills that come under his observation, and call for his attention.

With equal force could such a statement be made before a group of mathematicians, biologists, botanists, philosophers, historians, or other specialists employed in the college. No man who accepts a position on the faculty of a university is justified in the belief that his sphere of influence is limited to the narrow limits of mathematics, history, chemistry, or any specific field called for in the complex service rendered by the American university of today.

In all probability no man on the college campus has greater opportunity than the college physician for effective service in this complicated task of the college. In what I have to say, I am not ignoring the values of these special services, but I am convinced that we need to define our objective. That definition can not be stated in any better way than in the much used phrase—the making of a man. In the last analysis, that is the job of those of us connected with our schools today. We are too scientifically minded in our colleges. We have exalted research and worshiped at the shrine of knowledge to such a degree that President Butler of Columbia was led to say in his annual report a year ago that he has grown weary of handing out diplomas to educated barbarians.

That expression is at once an indictment of educational procedure and a pathetic confession of a failure of the college, particularly in view of the crying need for strong men in a time when fear and confusion are holding the world in bondage from which it can be delivered only at the hands of virile and intelligent men. Such men should be produced in our colleges, and the college physician must play no small part in that achievement.

What is this man that we need and that we talk about making? I do not presume to give a complete definition, and I can only suggest for your consideration certain qualities of a real man which the college physician, by virtue of his position, can cultivate and develop in these young men and women whom he meets so intimately. We need men of such intelligence as to think one or two things through to the beginning, as Hugh Walpole puts it. We need men of courage who are motivated by adventure and wholesome interest in their fellow men. We need men of stability possessed of a spirit of industry that will make a man's life on earth a fairly finished job. We need men of refinement who can give to this world the artistry of living pleasantly. In short, we need men of character.

I shall be condemned by a certain school of educators when I say that the things to which I have referred can be indoctrinated, but I contend that is the way real men have been made, and will continue to be made, until the Creator may decide to revise present natural laws of birth and growth, and decide to hurl a complete man into the arena of this world to begin his activities fully equipped.

It is astounding to find so little consciousness of this supreme responsibility existing in the minds of the men and women who have been assigned, and who have accepted, the task of training the youth of America. Not infrequently do we hear some such remark as this—"A college is not a reformatory." The implication of such a statement is that we have nothing to do with getting the kinks out of a boy's moral ideas, nothing to do with rubbing off rough edges of behavior, nothing to do with correcting bad physical habits; and that our job is to teach some particular course and trust to luck for the rest of it,—while the rest of it is much the more important, in the minds of parents, at least.

The State has a claim along these lines that the university is bound to respect, whether the institution be private or public. The schools occupy the most strategic position for developing an intelligent and honorable citizenry, and every man on a college faculty owes loyal allegiance to discharge the duty of creating the type of citizenship which makes for progress and a stable social order.

In this connection I conclude with a word as to the unconscious influence of the character of the physician. I refer to that subtle power that plays its part as an unseen force and passes from one personality to another with the same swift sureness that an electric spark passes from pole to pole.

APPENDIX I

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION OF RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING

During the Twenty-Ninth Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, a meeting in conjunction with the Section on Intercollegiate Athletics of the Physical Education Association was held at eleven o'clock, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, December 27, 1934, Professor Z. G. Clevenger, of Indiana University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: One year ago a committee was appointed by the National Collegiate to make as good a survey as it could possibly make by correspondence and other means, with regard to recruiting and subsidizing in the institutions throughout the country, and then, after gathering this information, if possible, to bring in a report that might help define what would be considered legitimate and illegitimate, or justifiable and unjustifiable, or proper and improper methods of approaching high school and preparatory students, and of course, if we approach them naturally the thing that is allied to that is what would be done with them after they get to the college.

This problem is a debatable one, and I think it is the most troublesome one we have to consider in our entire intercollegiate program. As you all know, those of you who have been in athletics for some time, it has many ramifications. We can't say it is one thing and stop there, because it seems to go everywhere. It goes to the public, to the alumni, to the institution, to the friends of the institution, and there seems to be no limit as to where these various influences come from or where they go.

This committee is composed of the chairman (the speaker), and Dr. Penick, of the University of Texas, Professor H. Diederichs, of Cornell University, Professor George Rider, of Miami University, and Professor C. E. Bilheimer, of Gettysburg College. We gathered together all the possible information we could with regard to every conference in the United States; that is, we gathered their printed material, and then we gathered from those institutions which are not members of conferences, at least from the majority of the leading institutions that are not members of the conferences, what printed material those institutions had governing intercollegiate athletics in those schools.

This material was studied very carefully by all the committee members and then the committee itself had a meeting last summer and went into the details as they appeared to the different members of the committee. We came to certain conclusions in our own minds; then, following that, the Executive Committee of the National Collegiate planned for another round table discussion, and that is what this meeting is today. We want each and every one of you to speak freely and frankly and as long as time will permit, with regard to any phase of recruiting and subsidizing you wish to speak about. The committee will then meet later this evening and formulate its final report to be presented to the National Collegiate Athletic Association tomorrow morning.

Needless to say, there isn't a man in this room who believes that this recruiting and subsidizing problem can be solved completely here today, or next year, or the year after. I suspect, since we are all human beings and since all of our institutions have thousands of friends who are honestly interested in the welfare of our institutions, that there will always be men who want to take advantage of this and that and the other thing to advance the interests of their own institutions, just the same as

there are business men, manufacturing men, who are trying to take advantage of the other fellow in order to gain certain results they would like to gain. So I want to say frankly that all I think we can do is to approach as nearly as we can to a set of ideals that the most of us at least can agree upon, and then try to see if we cannot approximate those ideals in the way we carry out the programs in our different institutions and conferences, and, of course, that will depend to a great extent upon the integrity of those handling the athletic programs in the institutions, and the integrity of those having charge of the various colleges and universities throughout the country.

We have no report to make to you gentlemen this morning. As I said, the report will be made tomorrow morning, but we do want to have a free discussion of recruiting and subsidizing. Some things are legitimate in the minds of all of us, I believe; other things are illegitimate, maybe not in the minds of all, but in the minds of a great many of us; but, having heard what different representatives here have to say to both sides of these various questions, the committee will try to form some sort of recommendations to present for action to the National Collegiate at its business meeting tomorrow morning.

Now, I haven't any particular problem to ask you about unless, of course, someone fails to bring up anything. Then, I will ask you what you think of certain things, in order to get this discussion started. So, without taking any more of your time and having started this meeting informally and hurriedly, as I have, in order to conserve as much time as possible for you gentlemen to debate these various points that may come up, I am now going to ask for volunteers to bring up any suggestion you would like to have brought up for discussion before this group.

I believe that everybody is deeply interested in an announcement that came out of Cornell University a short time ago, and I rather suspect the majority of the people are under a misapprehension as to just what that new regulation may be in that institution, and I think everybody would like to hear from someone connected with Cornell just exactly what has been done and what they plan to do, so that each of us may understand very clearly in the beginning of this discussion what has been done there. If he doesn't object, I should like very much at this time to ask Professor Diederichs, of Cornell, to make whatever statement he would care to make.

PROFESSOR H. DIEDERICHS (Cornell): I have a very distinct feeling that this sort of puts me "on the spot". I am glad to get the opportunity, though, because there has been, I think, a certain degree of misunderstanding, particularly due to the headlines which the newspaper writers saw fit to use as to what our attitude is at Cornell, and I think a little amplification would probably be in order, so for that reason I hope most of you did not stop at the headlines but read the statement itself, and I think in that you will find only one thing which seems to be a little different from what we have been doing before. I say "seems to be" because even that is only apparent.

That statement says that we see no reason at Cornell why a good boy should be discriminated against when it comes to scholarship benefits just because he has athletic ability. That is all the statement says.

Now, as to amplification on that. We have at present practically no so-called alumni scholarships. I deny if anywhere in that statement we are hinting at athletic scholarships; that is not intended, and we have not changed our position in that regard in the slightest, but there have been Cornell alumni associations in the country who have had in years past small stipends which they gave to qualified students. That has been so at Buffalo, at Rochester, in Northern New Jersey and Southern California, and in every case those stipends were very small and in every case they were given to home-town boys and girls. As far as these

alumni scholarships are concerned, they have been given only to boys (and girls, by the way) who were qualified by character and academic ability to receive those benefits, physical fitness being always third in order. In some of these clubs I think the scholarships are dormant now on account of the financial stringency, which is easy to understand. The only one I know of now is a very small amount being given to a student in the college of engineering. The man is not an athlete, and the only way I knew he had a stipend at all came in a roundabout way when I found out he got a prize for dancing.

Now, the statement seemed to imply that we were changing our stand radically and going out after athletes. I want to disabuse your mind of that particular idea, because it is not so, and although we did not say in the statement under what restrictions we would consider alumni scholarships (not athletic scholarships), I had these restrictions in mind in writing a letter that I sent to a member of one of our alumni clubs who wanted to know what this thing was all about; and, to make the position clear, I want to read what I wrote to this man, giving our view of this particular situation. Now, this is my personal opinion. It has not been approved by the committee at home, but I think it will be, if it is presented, and I say here that the restrictions on alumni in granting scholarships should be something like this:

1. That such benefits as there may be available shall come only through organized alumni clubs. I do not believe that we should stand for the subsidizing of an athlete by a number of alumni in the country here and there who simply got together and subscribed or underwrote a fund to be turned over to athletic material only.

2. That they shall be comparatively small, not to exceed tuition.

3. That the selection committee shall be made up of mature men only. The idea is to get away from young men who are likely to be football enthusiasts.

4. That applications shall be received from home-town boys and girls only, whose family history is known. That means that we object to any alumnus going two or three hundred miles away from home and picking out an outstanding high school boy of whom he knows absolutely nothing except that he can play football.

5. That the qualifications shall be in order: character, academic ability, and physical fitness.

6. That the selection of the clubs be reported, together with all data upon which a selection is based, to a committee at home for approval.

7. That the money be made available to, and be disbursed along with other scholarship funds by, the treasurer of the University.

Now, I am confident that as long as we at home feel this way, and as long as the very great majority of Cornell alumni feel the same way (and I know they do), this thing can never go astray. I think that is all I need to say, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Has anybody any question to ask or any other item to present at this time? I want to thank you, Professor Diederichs, because I am sure everyone here is glad to know just exactly what your committee had in mind at Cornell in taking this action.

Let me ask this question: Does anyone believe that it is legitimate to have a subsidy primarily for athletic ability, from which a boy could be paid? Whether anyone here believes that or not, I do not know, but I recall last year in our round table discussion at Chicago one gentleman arose and stated it was his belief that the time had arrived when we should have stated amounts to be given to these boys. If anybody wishes to bring that phase of this subject up, we should be glad to hear from him.

Might I say that the committee unanimously feels that such action would be illegitimate and is opposed to it.

Well, maybe this will bring somebody to the point of rising and saying something: Do you believe it is justifiable to employ prospective athletes before they matriculate in an institution, or to make advance payment before work is actually done; or to make any payment that is at a higher rate than other students receive for similar work?

PROFESSOR F. W. MARVEL (Brown University): Mr. Chairman, I don't think I can add anything. I came here to learn, to see how it was done. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: That is what we are all trying to do.

PROFESSOR MARVEL: I was very glad to hear this statement from Cornell, and I don't think it surprised anyone, I mean any one of us who has had anything to do with Cornell, and who knows how they have done things in the past. We know they could not and would not go astray in the future.

I don't think I have anything to add except something I said to a man last night, that I believe that 90 per cent, or perhaps more of the rumors and statements that we hear are not true. We hear these things, and those who have had long experience don't worry about it because we are practically sure they are not true, but I told this man last night that if a few of the men from each institution, when they hear these rumors, would simply get together informally and frankly tell each other what we hear, that is, get our feet under the table and present the facts, a lot of these rumors would fade away and disappear.

I think that if we all could subscribe here to the statement set forth this morning by Cornell University, and then get together and spike these rumors before they get all over the country, we could very nearly clean up a lot of this supposed subsidizing of athletes.

We all have scholarships, and I suppose that they are all based on the need of the student, on his personality and character, and on his scholarship, and, as long as we keep these three things in mind and do not allow any outside group of alumni or any other group of men to pass these scholarships along to the boys over the heads of the university, we are doing something worth while. If everything were left to the athletic committees, I think we would soon be on the right track.

This is one of the problems we will always have and I think we are all trying to handle it correctly and in the right way. I think athletes are on a higher plane today than they have been in any of the years I have had anything to do with athletics, and if you only knew some of the things that we thought existed a few years ago, you would think we are living in a very happy, fine time today.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Dr. King, do you have any observations to make on any phase of this, or upon the questions I just asked?

DR. H. H. KING (Kansas State College): I don't believe I have anything to contribute in this impromptu fashion. I will say, however, that I was very happily pleased with the report from the Dean of Cornell University, after having read the scare headlines to the effect that Cornell was going out after athletes and would soon be having a great football team again; but, having heard the Dean express in this precise manner the situation there, I cannot see anything that will bring anyone into Cornell particularly because of his athletic ability.

I want to agree with what the gentleman said before about rumors. In our district a few years ago we had some sessions on subsidizing and recruiting, and I was a member of a special committee that was to investigate a certain institution. We spent two or three days on the campus calling in the boys that had been reputed to have received such large salaries, and we found there was nothing to it, and in only one

case was there any one of the students who was really open to question, and that was somewhat doubtful.

I learned here a few moments ago from one of my good friends that it is reported that our little quarterback had received a thousand dollars to come to our institution from Southern California, and I find I shouldn't throw any stones if that is the situation. I happen to know, however, that that boy was unknown to the athletic committee until he appeared on our campus and interviewed us and said he wished to enter the institution, so I want further to emphasize that I think a great deal of this is rumor and when you get down to sound facts, it is not as bad as it appears.

MR. H. J. STEGEMAN (University of Georgia): I suppose the greatest apprehension everyone has about speaking about subsidizing lies in the fact that no one seems to know exactly what subsidizing is, whether the giving of a legitimate scholarship to men who play football is subsidizing, when that scholarship is open to all men in the University, or all women, for that matter.

I think the main difficulty has been the fact that there never has been a clear definition by any organization as to what subsidizing means, whether it means tuition alone, or if it means additional college expenses, or if it means certain stipends that students can use for themselves. If that is subsidizing, then a great number of schools could settle their own problems. If certain small awards for excellence, which go sometimes to debaters, sometimes to outstanding social men like the dancer the Dean mentioned—if those things should be open to athletes, then certain other schools might know whether or not they are subsidizing their own men.

I think the actual lack of a thoroughly workable definition of subsidizing is one of the biggest handicaps this organization will ever have in coming to conclusions about the evil of it, or the growth of it, or the presence of it.

I said last year at this meeting that I thought it would not be a bad idea if some committee appointed could work out a definite code, or a clear definition, by which we could come to some conclusion. Until that is done, I doubt if any of us will know really whether we are subsidizing our athletes. I certainly would like very much to have information, or to have the group come to some very definite understanding as to what really constitutes illegitimate subsidizing of athletes.

It is one of the questions that we argue upon as to different points without anyone's actually knowing what the actual extent or meaning of it is.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: I think you are quite right as to the fact that it is hard to determine just where "legitimate" ends and "illegitimate" may begin. As Major Griffith pointed out to us, a boy might reach over across a fence and take an apple. Well, I suppose under the legal, technical term, that would be stealing, but in your mind or mine, or in the minds of some of the rest, we wouldn't think he was a very great criminal, probably.

Mr. Stegeman, the committee is trying to arrive at some recommendation such as you suggested. I wonder if you would object to telling us what you personally think of the question I asked, and that is with regard to promising a boy employment before he matriculates into school, or paying him some advance money before the work is actually done, and also whether you believe it would be proper to pay him at a higher rate of pay than other students would receive for similar work.

These are things coming before the committee, and it wishes help in reaching its conclusions, and that is what we hope to get from you gentlemen today, and we hope, of course, that everybody will benefit by the other man's viewpoint.

MR. STEGEMAN: It would be rather hard to answer that directly. As to the matter of giving employment to students for labor, that seems to indicate that some athletic departments have money which they can use at their own discretion, as far as labor is concerned. I doubt if the student working his way through college would welcome that type of competition very much, if the departments that look after employment or self-help would disregard the requests for employment of students already in college in favor of students not yet entered in college. I doubt if a department of employment or self-help doing that would be very popular.

If athletic money which is budgeted for salaries or wages or payrolls is used for prospective students, I am afraid that that would be rather discriminating against students who might be in college and probably need it to continue their course. That, to me, would appear to be a very dangerous method of approaching young men who are not registered in college. It might lead to inducing men to come who were really not prepared to come. I doubt whether that method is employed a great deal, and, if it is, I would certainly classify that as an extremely dangerous use of money.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Mr. Yost, what are your personal convictions with regard to offering a boy employment before he enrolls in a university, whether he should receive a higher rate of pay or anything in advance of having completed the work?

MR. FIELDING H. YOST (University of Michigan): In the first place, I think we have three words we need to define, as suggested. What do we mean by "proselyting?" What do we mean by "subsidizing?" What do we mean by "recruiting?" Or do we mean all the same thing in the use of those three words?

In my opinion, no prospective student should be offered anything by anyone in order to induce or influence him to enter the university. I think your question did not imply that you meant the use of athletic funds.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Any university funds.

MR. YOST: I don't think any prospective student should be promised any kind of employment. I think there should be very little employment by the athletic association of the athletes after they enter the university.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Do you think they should receive any difference in rate of pay than other students?

MR. YOST: No, I think they should have just the same as every other student on the campus.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Now, possibly somebody else would have a different opinion. We would like to have it, if any individual has another viewpoint, if anybody feels that it is perfectly proper to approach a high school student or preparatory student, and hold out to him the prospect of a certain job in the institution.

PROFESSOR B. F. OAKES (University of Montana): I hope that anything I have to say will not be interpreted as being in favor of, or against, athletic scholarships; however, personally, I am not convinced myself. I have been in institutions that handle the matter in various ways. There are two sides of the question, and I should like to hear it discussed a little more, and perhaps I will bring up the subject.

I feel that recruiting or subsidizing, whatever you want to call it—they are both poor terms—if we had athletic scholarships, we would not have those terms, I believe—cannot be really stopped. It is much like

scouting in football. I doubt if any way exists to control it absolutely. It is pretty difficult to prevent a prominent and wealthy alumnus from taking a liking to an exceptional prospect in high school and aiding the boy financially, to see that he gets along in college satisfactorily, for the benefit of his own institution and for the boy's benefit, too. We don't want to overlook that point.

It is a thing that is very difficult to control, as we have found in scouting, in attempting to make non-scouting agreements.

As yet I do not know of any non-scouting agreement that has continued successfully.

Another point: I will accept the fact that there will be subsidizing and recruiting. I believe we will be up against it as long as we have athletics and as long as we do not have athletic scholarships.

I don't think it is proper for a boy to be approached in a *sub rosa* fashion and be made a proposition, with the boy knowing that he is being offered something that is not generally known, that is supposed to be kept under cover. I think in that case we are educating the boy in an entirely wrong way, and starting him off with a little crooked education,—the start of a racketeer, for that matter; but I doubt very much if we can stop it.

It seems a very simple proposition to stop it by giving legitimate athletic scholarships, and I feel sometimes that we who are closest to it in the coaching profession, speaking from the football coach's standpoint, see it in a little different light. It makes it a little more difficult in dealing with the boy's character, and it strikes home to the heart of the coach a little more closely than possibly to some of the rest of you.

I know that with the legitimate athletic scholarship that difficulty is overcome. That attitude is not accepted by the boy. Everything is above-board. It is better for the boy, I think, in the cases where I have seen athletic scholarships in operation. I have not seen a boy spoiled by it, but under the other system I have seen boys hurt occasionally, though not as often as you would expect.

Of course, we have to think of scholarship primarily,—scholarship, character, and all the rest of it,—but why hold athletic ability against a boy, when it is the finest thing he represents in cleanliness, health, and good thinking and good living? It is something I really think we should aid and develop, but, of course, we can't get away from scholarship and character and personality, promise, and so forth.

I should like to hear more in favor of or against athletic scholarships from the character standpoint of the boy, and as to whether we can absolutely stop offers to athletes,—whether we think it is practical or not. I don't think it is in scholarships. We can't keep information from coming to us. It will come in the mail and in various other ways.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: You refer, Mr. Oakes, to purely athletic scholarships, not scholarships that might be open to any boy or girl in the institution?

PROFESSOR OAKES: Only where such institution gives scholarships of a similar nature, and as many or more for scholastic or other attainments, would there be given also scholarships for athletics. I wouldn't say primarily athletics or athletic attainment.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: I should like to call upon a gentleman who has been in this business a little bit, to give us the benefit of his observations,—Dean Sackett, of Pennsylvania State.

DEAN R. L. SACKETT: It seems to me there are some things we might say to clear the atmosphere, and to make clear certain distinctions.

In the reports of the Cornell development, the newspapers devoted some space to it. It has been referred to this morning here. Now, at

no time, so far as I know, in the Carnegie Report, or anywhere else, has there been the charge made against an institution that it was giving athletic endowments when the institution as such was giving aid to all students and any students upon the same general basis of scholastic ability, character, and background, and the saving clause in the case of Cornell is that the final decision lies with the institution. Some of these various scholarships go to athletes, to be sure. Why should they be legislated against? Nobody has proposed it, and the Carnegie Report made no such suggestion, and we do not need, seriously, to consider that matter.

Where the institution gives scholarships equitably to those who take music, or journalism, or debating, or who participate in athletics on the same level, emphasizing scholarship and achievement in the institution, then there is no question concerning subsidizing.

The next statement that I wish to make is that it seems to me we expend a good deal of energy in the discussion of borderline cases. I think we will accomplish quite a little if we devote ourselves to the main issues and clarify them in our minds and stick to them. There will always be instances where an alumnus, or a group of alumni, will evade us, but it is our business to be alert to the fact that there may be such subsidizing and to take the responsibility, so far as an institution can, for looking into these matters.

I want to say a word concerning the matter of rumors, which was raised by the gentleman from Brown, and mentioned by others. There are unfounded rumors, but they are, nevertheless, disturbing to our relationships one with another. I have no particular panacea or cure for it, but in the State of Pennsylvania we have organized a Pennsylvania Athletic Eligibility Conference, and one of its purposes is to present these rumors, if they are worth presenting, or suppress them if they are not,—to present the evidence in a gentlemanly way to our friend in the other institution, if we have something we feel in our own self-respect we can present as being of sufficient consequence to present it to him with such facts as we have, and get his answer.

So far as our experience is concerned, we have had no charges since the organization of this Conference. Relationships, I think, tend to reduce those unfounded rumors. I should like to know where they come from, and I think it is an important matter that we, who have responsibilities to our faculties, should take an interest in looking to see where these rumors come from, and suppressing them.

Gentlemen, I think this is an extremely valuable subject to discuss, to get a common understanding, and I am very much pleased at the size of your audience, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLEVENGER: Thank you, sir. I wonder if Mr. Percy Carpenter, of Worcester Polytechnic Institute, would care to make a statement, because there may be many misleading reports with regard to what has taken place there. I don't wish to embarrass him in any way, but I thought he would like to clear up some points there that we do not understand.

MR. P. R. CARPENTER: I had an idea that, inasmuch as my institution had become nationally famous, something might be asked of me today.

For those who don't know it, it is a small engineering college of about six hundred students, in Worcester, Massachusetts. Until about two weeks ago we had been progressing in our normal, quiet sort of way, until one morning I awoke to find that we were spread all over the newspapers and had become nationally famous.

Now, in order to corroborate what Professor Marvel, of Brown, has just mentioned about publicity, I will tell you how that thing arose. The Alumni Secretary, in the *Alumni Journal*, wrote a little article which was more or less in a facetious vein, an appeal to the alumni of the institution

to be on the lookout for good boys who would like to go to college and want to become engineers, and get busy in their particular sections and encourage them to go to Worcester Tech, and he said, "Worcester Tech would like good athletes." Well, who wouldn't, who has athletic teams. The newspaper men took those six words and discarded all the rest of the article and spread it all over the paper, and we have been receiving clippings from coast to coast about our new venture in athletics.

The Alumni Secretary wrote an article of several hundred words, and the newspapers neglected to report anything of the import of the rest of the article. In the rest of the article he said, "Don't forget, to get into Worcester Tech they must pass their examinations, must be good students, and, if you find a good athlete, he won't be of any use to us unless he is a good student first."

It happened that several sections of local alumni have grouped together and they have raised a little money in their local sections, as has been suggested, for the home-town boys, and in two or three sections seven or eight cities have been grouped together as a circle, and the high school students of the seven or eight cities may compete for one of the alumni scholarships, but they must be in the top quarter of the class and have good high school records, and the other qualifications must be of a high grade. Those boys wouldn't last more than one semester, if they would that, unless they possessed those qualifications.

We are an engineering school. This year there wasn't one night in the week when the football coach had all of his squad on the field before five o'clock, when it was dark, and flood lights have had to be used.

That is one of the most unfortunate things about undesirable newspaper publicity, the relationship of our colleges to other colleges. For the large teams, like Harvard, and Princeton, and Yale, I want to assure them we are not going to ask to get on their schedules through any athletes we may acquire, and to the small New England colleges with whom we have pleasant relations, I ask them not to put too much credence in this publicity and erase us from their schedules. I have talked to the football coach and told him if he doesn't win a game for two or three years it doesn't matter, but if he does win a game or more than one or two, it will be too bad. Someone is going to say, "There you are! There's what money will do!"

This whole explosion arose through this little article which the Alumni Secretary wrote in a somewhat facetious vein, and the press took it and said, "There is one on this college. They have come out and said they are going after athletes," with all the other implications which they could give to the small article.

We haven't any more money than we have had. We hope to have more for more scholarships or endowment, but for several years to come I don't think we will be any higher in the list in games won or lost than in the years past.

If anyone has any doubt of our honesty or our integrity, I shall be glad to answer any questions that might be asked.

CHAIRMAN CLEVENGER: Thank you very much. Has anyone any questions to ask? I am sure we are all happy to have this explanation, because the reports, as you say, that go out over the country would, I imagine, cause the high school and preparatory students to begin to floor your mails with applications for those fine positions.

MR. CARPENTER: In regard to that, two or three days after this broke in the newspapers, there was a headline in the paper: "Worcester Tech Flooded With Applications of Football Men or Students." At that time I had had one letter come to my office, and it was from a boy three years out of high school. He had been working, and he said he would like to go to college and wanted to be an engineer, but he did admit that he had read the article, and thought that a good football player might

make money out of it. Since then some other letters have come in, and in all cases they have been handed to the registrar with the remark, "Please send this boy a catalog."

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: I should like to have someone else speak, if he will, please, on the giving of scholarships, loans, or aids to athletes, as well as other students, or in preference to athletes, or whether any of these should be given by a committee within the athletic department, or whether all of them should be given by a committee completely divorced from the athletic department.

DR. EDWIN FAUVER (Rochester University): Before this group breaks up, I think it would be interesting to have an informal raising of hands to decide what percentage of this group, if it could be done, would eliminate all subsidies paid to athletes. I am not convinced that people are entirely sure they want to eliminate this phase of our university athletics.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: You mean subsidize in the form of tuition?

DR. FAUVER: Any kind, any abnormal or illegitimate subsidies.

MR. ROMEYN BERRY (Cornell University): Does he mean eliminate from his own college or from the rival college? (Laughter)

DR. FAUVER: I mean eliminate from intercollegiate competition in the United States of America, and I would include Canada, if they wish to be included in that. The second question I wish to ask is: Why, if this is an honorable proposition, doesn't somebody very proficient in it explain to us all and to the committee just how it is done?

I think the Cornell gentleman has explained how they are guiding it. I should like to hear an expert in the matter explain how it is done, if it is an honorable proposition, this hiring of athletes—let's call it by the Anglo-Saxon term.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: I suspect if I would put the question, how many here believe in hiring athletes, I wouldn't get many favorable replies. I rather suspect if I put the question the other way, on the basis of illegitimate subsidizing, a great majority would vote for it, and I suspect a great majority, or at least a good percentage, would be a little doubtful as to what is illegitimate subsidizing, at least in contrast with what some other gentlemen might think would be illegitimate; but I think it is all right, Dr. Fauver, to raise that question and I will be glad to put it in the way you suggest, and that was: How many here would be in favor of barring from intercollegiate competition boys who are illegitimately subsidized?

DR. FAUVER: If it could be done. I think there is a point there.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Let's put the first one and see. There will be no record taken. Indicate by raising your hands or keeping them down. How many here would be in favor of barring from intercollegiate competition boys who are illegitimately subsidized?

How many would be in favor of permitting boys who are illegitimately subsidized to compete just the same?

At least, Dr. Fauver, the vote is all for the former, whether the belief is or not.

MR. BERRY: I feel moved to tell a story which I think is not particularly applicable to this situation, merely to try to persuade Dr. Fauver that he is never going to get his question answered in open meeting.

It is a story which is told, though no doubt not true, about the early

days of the formation of the steel companies, in which there was great enterprise. You will remember that the late J. Pierpont Morgan had much to do with it, and one of the brilliant young men at the time was Mr. Schwab, of the Bethlehem Steel Company, and I have no doubt this story is about a thing that never happened.

In the early days of the steel company, Mr. Schwab was supposed to have been sent to Europe to get orders for the new outfit, and he went and was very successful and got a great many orders, but in the course of time the rumor leaked back that Mr. Schwab, then a young man, on his business trip had not been entirely Puritanical in his conduct, out of office hours, and he was called in by Mr. Morgan, who said, "Charlie, this is a great bunch of orders you have gotten, but the rumor is coming back that your conduct on this trip wasn't just all it ought to be."

Mr. Schwab got mad and he said, "Mr. Morgan, that is all true and I know perfectly well that I am not going to stand any of this hypocrisy. I have only done openly and frankly and honestly what you and Mr. So-and-So, and Mr. So-and-So, have been doing behind closed doors."

Mr. Morgan thought a long time and then he said, "Charlie, that is what closed doors are for." (Laughter)

The application of that story is that Dr. Fauver's question isn't going to be answered here.

MR. YOST: I think everyone here can answer that question easily in his own mind and to his own satisfaction. If you use the words "illegitimate subsidizing," he will determine, of course, what is illegitimate.

What do you mean by subsidizing? What is right or wrong? What do we mean by proselyting? What is right? What is wrong? What do we mean by recruiting? What is right and what is wrong?

Everyone may have an opinion and an answer, and work it out in detail. We might have all kinds of different answers to that.

DR. FAUVER: I have the greatest sympathy for Mr. Schwab, but I don't see why some of the other gentlemen don't respond as he did and admit what they are doing and tell how it is done.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Has anyone any further comment on this? If not, we should like to ask if anyone has anything to say further with regard to the granting of scholarships, loans, and aids to athletes any differently than they are granted to other students or by committees that are different from the regular committees granting those in the institution, or do we all believe that they are entitled to grants, loans, and scholarships exactly upon the same basis as any other student in the institution when those grants are made by the same committee which handles them for any of the other students in the institution?

If anyone has any comments to make upon this, we should be glad to hear from him. The reason I ask some of these things is that the committee is trying to arrive at some possible conclusion with regard to recommendations that may in a way meet what Mr. Yost brings up. I don't suppose anyone, though, could set up a definition that would define recruiting and subsidizing to the satisfaction of this group. I don't believe that could be done, but it might be possible to set up some definitions that would at least approximate what this group feels, and then, of course, it will all come back, where it always come back, I believe, to the integrity and the honesty of the people administering these programs in the conferences and institutions throughout the country, plus the integrity and honesty and wishes of the administrations of the colleges and universities.

But I should like to have any comments that anyone will make on any of these subjects or on any others you think should be considered at this time or should be brought up.

MR. MACDONALD (Colorado State College): I am persuaded that there is an answer to the question you are asking, and I think we in the West maybe have answered it, but there is a question uppermost with us just now and I wonder if your committee has concerned itself with it. I think I could ask it by simply saying this: What would be the privileges of a coach in leaving his campus to talk with prospective athletes? For instance, the calls on a coach are many. He is called to address a Rotary Club in an adjoining town. He is called on to go down to a town where a Chamber of Commerce is honoring a championship football team, and be the speaker on that occasion.

A group of alumni call him to some city and say to him, "We have advertised that you are coming today and that you are to be in this hotel, and the prominent athletes of this community are going to call on you today."

Again, this coach is sent on a good-will tour throughout the whole state, to talk with students of every sort, and to create good will and to give inducements, as he can, to students who come to hear him.

All of those phases of coaches leaving the campus have come up for consideration, especially in what is known as the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference, comprising twelve institutions in that region, and before I go back, I would like to receive a little bit of light on that question: What are the privileges of an athletic coach in leaving his campus to discuss with prospective students matters of athletics? Has that question concerned your committee? Is it apropos?

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Yes, sir, I think that question does concern the committee, and the committee has thought about it and will be happy to have comments from the gentlemen here with regard to it. We have thought we would bring up the point whether a coach or member of the athletic department should initiate any sort of correspondence with prospective athletes, whether he should initiate meetings with them, whether it should be done by any member of the department of physical education.

I am sure, Mr. Macdonald, the gentlemen here would be glad to have your viewpoint on this also, if you would feel free to give it to us, as to your convictions whether it is right or wrong.

MR. MACDONALD: I think it is up to us to draw the line, and I think it would be this, maybe. Of course, you can answer calls to address civic organizations, if a call comes for you to go; and you can be present at a place where they are honoring a champion football team and you are the speaker; you are welcome to go. That is talking to people *en masse*, and, of course, it ought to be permissible. But when you locate yourself at a hotel and advertise, and the alumni in that neighborhood are telling that you are there to talk with athletes, it develops perhaps a different situation, and we wonder if that is the point where he should be limited in his operations on leaving the campus. I think that is about what most of you would feel, and yet someone has said that the minute you let your coach leave the campus at all, you are on dangerous ground. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Has anyone any remarks to make with regard to this very important question, I think, that Mr. Macdonald has brought before us?

MR. H. A. LORENZ (Lafayette College): Some time ago I heard an important study described, a study made of some institutions not recruiting for athletes, but for students, in the days of the depression, and from that report I would say the average football coach was a piker compared with some of the institutional officers recruiting, for just plain students. Football coaches ought to look into that and get some new methods, for

recruiting for students has so far surpassed recruiting for athletes that the whole subject of recruiting should be taken into consideration by some other organization.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: I believe you are right, but if we do something to help our own institution, we will take in enough territory.

DR. JOHN M. HARMON (Boston University): I think we do answer many questions about proselyting in a statement in positive terms of the purpose of intercollegiate athletics. Many of us have been saying that the first objective was health, and the second, the proper use of leisure time. Now, if we are writing those statements of the objectives of intercollegiate athletics, we could answer most of these questions easily in relation to those purposes.

If we are wrong in those statements, we need a restatement of the purpose of intercollegiate athletics.

I should like to ask just one question and it is this: Do you feel that the institution owes an athlete something of intrinsic value for the time he spends in practice? I should like to give my own answer, as a physical educator, and it is this. We should expect the student to be a better student, because of the two hours of activity per day, than the individual who does not have that exercise every day. I have been telling faculties and boys that for many years. I expect the boy to be a better student because he has the exercise every day, because he should have better health to study through that exercise.

I should like, Mr. Chairman, to have this committee designate the objectives of intercollegiate athletics, and then most of us might answer the questions we have in our local situation.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: I think that would go to another committee of the N. C. A. A. rather than the one we are operating on. We have the troublesome problem of recruiting and subsidizing, and when you have recruiting, subsidizing will follow. They go hand in hand.

Answering Professor Macdonald, I could answer one part of your question as far as I am concerned, and at least the majority of the group would answer it that way. I think it is improper for a coach to go to a hotel and bring in high school and preparatory boys who are prospective players on his teams, to meet with him there.

As to the question of preventing the coach from leaving the campus I rather think that might be ideal, but I doubt if many of us could do it, because there are some groups that call upon coaches to make addresses, and I think we would find it almost impossible to keep them from accepting some of those invitations; but that is a question that will come before our committee.

MR. YOST: I think you can answer that question. If you can't trust him off the campus to do the right thing, why in the world do you keep him on your campus?

MR. LUTHER D. GROSSMAN (Susquehanna University): My only excuse for being on my feet is because I am afflicted with a dual position, that of being alumni secretary, as well as being engaged in athletics, and I am interested in several of the statements.

Mr. Lorenz is absolutely right. In the past two weeks I received the annual report from the American Alumni Council. If you think coaches are the only people recruiting students, you just read that report. It is a problem for most institutions today to get students and the type of students that they want. That causes me to believe that this problem that we are considering, though we have a very definite and difficult phase of the problem to consider, nevertheless involves not only those of us in athletics, but the whole institution, and, furthermore, I feel very definitely

it calls for what I believe Dean Sackett has said they try to do at Pennsylvania State, and that is to educate gradually their alumni to a new viewpoint, and I believe that is essential. Thirdly, this week I received, since I am also alumni secretary, a publication from the Cornell Council, and in that publication was a complete report of the Comptroller, and you will find one page after the other, listing various funds that have been given to Cornell University, the income from those funds to be used for specific purposes.

So, I believe three things, in the matter of subsidizing. First, it is not alone in the field of athletics; college administrators and presidents are concerned about the unethical practices that are carried on by some institutions in subsidizing students of all types, not alone athletes. The second thing is, speaking from the alumni standpoint, I believe we can do much to help our alumni to get a new viewpoint which will reduce the occasions when alumni will invite the coach to come to a city and send in athletes for an interview. Third, if more and more institutions (and I am speaking for my own as well as others) would publish and broadcast, especially to alumni, all of the funds and scholarships that are available, and the recipients of the benefits of those scholarships, I believe we would be accomplishing something; however, those things are somewhat outside of our realm, but I think they have a bearing, at least in my own mind, on the problem, speaking as one who is afflicted with two particular positions.

DEAN SACKETT: It isn't necessary, but I rise to the defense of the coach. I think Mr. Yost has said a good deal in a very few words. The coaches ought to be permitted and encouraged to go from the campus as other members of the faculty are encouraged to go, and do go, on various occasions to speak to Rotary Clubs, or alumni, or women's organizations, or what not, and the point is, it seems to me, this: that if the coach, in going around is not pursuing what we call an ethical practice, it is our fault, and I am not connected, you understand, with athletics. I am assuming my responsibility, and it is mine. He should represent the institution in a fair way, presenting athletics, of course, but presenting other aspects of the institution as well, and we must realize that alumni organizations are human and that they are interested in hearing about athletics, and such defenses and alibis as may be given, prospects for the future, and all that. I see nothing wrong in the coach going out, the institution taking the responsibility for what he does.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: I think that is absolutely right, Dean Sackett, that every institution should assume the responsibility for his coach, and, as Mr. Yost says, if he isn't the right kind of character, possibly a resignation should be accepted.

I might say that we have heard various sides of our recruiting and subsidizing problem, and I have asked some specific questions hoping to get answers, and have many that I am sure will be most helpful to all of us. On the whole we have heard mostly laudatory remarks with regard to the condition of athletics as they are in the country today, but I am reminded of a little story myself, and it is to this effect, that a colored woman lost her husband, and she was sitting down here in front at the funeral with eight or nine children, and the minister was making a most laudatory address with regard to this man, and he became so flowery and so profuse in all the fine things that he said, that she leaned over to one of the children and said, "Rastus, peep up there and see if that is your pappy!"

Now we may be, and I hope we are, in a better condition than we have been at any time with regard to recruiting and subsidizing, but I think we will only approach what we are all working for by keeping everlastingly at it in every institution and in every conference and in every gathering like this.

The president of the National Collegiate Athletic Association is with us and he has studied this recruiting and subsidizing problem from every possible angle, for the last twenty-five years, and before we adjourn, I should like to have him say a few words to all of us.

PRESIDENT GRIFFITH: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I feel this has been a very interesting and worthwhile session. Perhaps some will go away feeling discouraged because we haven't solved the recruiting and subsidizing problem, but I dare say if we had spent an hour in discussing and trying to define sin we shouldn't have gotten very much farther.

I think one of our troubles is perhaps that we are inclined to feel that our children are all right, but we are not so sure about our neighbor's children.

I remember the presidents in some six or seven hundred colleges a few years ago were asked a number of questions, among them this: Do you think there is any illegitimate recruiting or subsidizing in your institution? Without exception they said they were sure there was none in their institutions but most of them said they weren't so sure about the other fellows.

That is perhaps one of our problems. I like to start, however, with this premise, which I think is fairly sound, that our presidents and faculties and directors are honest men; they want to do about what is right in this activity as they do in other activities. We may not agree, however, as to what is right, and what is desirable, and what is undesirable.

As I see it, there is, first of all, the general problem, that is, as it relates to the boy. If a practice is followed that makes the boy a party to deceit, certainly that practice is wrong, and there is the moral side of the question. And then there is the specific problem which I think comes under the head of equal competition. Your institution plays normally in a small homogeneous group of colleges, and one institution issues athletic scholarships, and yours does not. That is not fair competition and, consequently, it is necessary for you to meet that competition or to refuse to compete with the institution that follows those practices, and, as I see the problem, it will ultimately be pretty much solved in that way, when the time comes that the institutions that do not want to subsidize will refuse to compete with those that they feel do subsidize, and after a while the fellows who want to subsidize will have to play among themselves.

I think we ought not to close without this thought being presented, namely, that the National Collegiate Athletic Association has never assumed the responsibility of trying to be a governing body. We believe in states' rights. These are local problems. Perhaps all that the N. C. A. A. can do is in an educational way to try to state standards or ideals.

Twenty-five years ago, for instance, the Association suggested there were certain things desirable,—the one-year rule, the three-year rule, the scholarship rule, and the amateur rule, and so forth, and in the twenty-five years most of the colleges of America have adopted all or part of those suggested requirements, and yet an institution may belong to the N. C. A. A. that doesn't observe any of those suggested requirements; in other words, what I am trying to say is that I feel that in a way the Association has accomplished some good, and I, being an optimist, believe that in an educational way over a period of years we may accomplish some good in the matter of eliminating undesirable practices in the matter of getting desirable athletes.

Our pacifist friends would outlaw war; others would outlaw sin; others would outlaw crime; and others feel that this Association ought to find some method of outlawing the hiring of athletes. I don't believe that we can outlaw any of those. We may kid ourselves by passing rules and regulations, but we won't make much progress by legislative methods.

We can make progress when the time comes that the majority of our educators and athletic men feel that it is not desirable to pay boys for playing football.

I think the serious problem relates to organized recruiting and subsidizing. As Dean Sackett points out, we usually hear the arguments that relate to borderline cases, and borderline laws are always difficult laws, but we are pretty well agreed, after all, regarding the extremes that relate to this problem, and if we would honestly face the problem with that in mind and try to eliminate the extreme evils, then we would be making progress.

Then, in conclusion, we believe in competition. Athletics is a very highly competitive activity. We believe in competition in the matter of drawing desirable students to our respective institutions. That is natural, but somebody says that men cheat when they compete, so the thing to do is to eliminate competition. That is not the American way. The American way is to get boys together and say, "We will play the game according to certain rules," and, like gentlemen, we play it according to those rules.

I think your committee will perform a worthwhile service in suggesting certain standards, as to the way we may play the game in the matter of competing for desirable students who are good athletes, and I think, Mr. Clevenger, we all ought to thank you and the other members of the committee for the time you have given to the study of the problem and for the suggestions you will bring before the convention tomorrow.

APPENDIX II

REPORT OF THE TREASURER, 1934

FRANK W. NICOLSON, in account with the
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Dr.

1934			
		To balance carried forward	\$5,237.30
Jan.	2	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	14.00
		West Chester Teachers College	25.00
		University of Georgia	25.00
		Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association	25.00
		Iowa State College	25.00
	8	Centenary College	25.00
	10	American Sports Publishing Co.:	
		Royalty on Football Rules	\$1,535.05
		Royalty on Track Rules	105.00
			1,640.05
	16	Villanova College	50.00
	19	DePauw University	50.00
	20	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	39.30
	27	State University of Iowa	50.00
		Colorado Agricultural College	25.00
Feb.	5	Ohio State University	25.00
		University of Cincinnati	25.00
		University of Florida	50.00
	16	Case School of Applied Science	25.00
		Clarkson College	25.00
	22	Boxing Rules Committee	3.13
Mar.	1	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	24.33
	28	Boxing Rules Committee	8.00
Apr.	5	Amherst College	25.00
	6	Cornell University	25.00
		Swarthmore College	25.00
	7	Franklin and Marshall College	25.00
		Johns Hopkins University	25.00
		University of Maryland	25.00
	9	U. S. Naval Academy	25.00
		Hamilton College	25.00
		University of Tennessee	25.00
	10	University of Notre Dame	25.00
		U. S. Military Academy	25.00
	11	Dartmouth College	25.00
		Georgetown University	25.00
		Gettysburg College	25.00
		Brown University	25.00
		Temple University	25.00
	12	Norwich University	25.00
		Knox College	25.00
		Yale University	25.00

		University of Chicago	25.00
		Union College	25.00
		Susquehanna University	25.00
		Rice Institute	25.00
		Mass. Institute of Technology	25.00
13		University of New Hampshire	25.00
		Columbia University	25.00
		Vanderbilt University	25.00
		Western State Teachers College	25.00
		Colgate University	25.00
		University of Rochester	25.00
14		Worcester Polytechnic Institute	25.00
		University of Delaware	25.00
		Manhattan College	25.00
		Alfred University	25.00
		Drake University	25.00
		S. California Athletic Conference	25.00
16		Hobart College	25.00
		Washington and Lee University	25.00
		University of Nebraska	25.00
17		Wesleyan University	25.00
18		University of Pittsburgh	25.00
		Connecticut State College	25.00
19		Mass. State College	25.00
		Lafayette College	25.00
20		Duquesne University	25.00
		Dickinson College	25.00
		Middlebury College	25.00
		American Sports Publishing Co.:	
		Royalty on Soccer Rules	\$57.57
		Royalty on Ice Hockey Rules	59.85
		Royalty on Wrestling Rules	41.55
			158.97
23		University of Virginia	25.00
		Howard University	25.00
		Bradley Polytechnic Institute	25.00
24		College of the City of New York	25.00
26		New York University	25.00
		Washington University	25.00
27		Trinity College	25.00
		Tulane University	25.00
30		University of Oregon	25.00
		University of Texas	25.00
		Stevens Institute of Technology	25.00
		University of Pennsylvania	25.00
May	1	Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	25.00
	3	Boston College	25.00
	7	University of S. California	25.00
	8	Oberlin College	25.00
	11	Michigan State Normal College	25.00
	14	Miami University	25.00
		Carleton College	25.00
	19	Clemson College	25.00
		Marquette University	25.00
	21	Denison University	25.00
	24	College of Wooster	25.00
	29	Princeton University	25.00
		University of Vermont	25.00
	31	Ohio Wesleyan University	25.00
June	4	University of Minnesota	25.00

		J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	9.66
26		J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	1.68
		University of the South	25.00
July	6	Pennsylvania Military College	25.00
Sept.	7	Interest from Savings Bank	86.38
	27	Rutgers College	25.00
	28	Harvard University	25.00
Oct.	2	Tufts College	25.00
		Lehigh University	25.00
	3	Norwich University	25.00
		St. Lawrence University	25.00
		Mercersburg Academy	10.00
	4	Boston University	25.00
		Catholic University of America	25.00
	5	Bowdoin College	25.00
		Butler University	25.00
		University of Detroit	25.00
		Williams College	25.00
	6	U. S. Coast Guard Academy	25.00
		Fordham University	25.00
	7	Kansas State College	25.00
	8	University of Maine	25.00
	9	Oregon State College	25.00
	10	Lawrenceville School	10.00
	11	University of Kansas	25.00
	12	International Y. M. C. A. College	25.00
		Mount St. Mary's College	25.00
		Carnegie Institute	25.00
13		Andover Academy	10.00
		Indiana University	25.00
		Lawrence College	25.00
		Stanford University	25.00
		University of Michigan	25.00
		Ohio State University	25.00
		Purdue University	25.00
15		Haverford College	25.00
		Syracuse University	25.00
		University of California	25.00
		Ohio University	25.00
18		Bates College	25.00
		Knox College	25.00
19		Rhode Island State College	25.00
		University of Washington	50.00
		University of Buffalo	25.00
20		Alabama Polytechnic Institute	25.00
22		University of Wisconsin	25.00
		University of Illinois	50.00
		Michigan State College	50.00
23		J. E. Raycroft, Handbook	39.86
24		Baylor University	25.00
25		Coe College	25.00
		Allegheny College	25.00
29		State University of Iowa	25.00
		University of Colorado	25.00
Nov.	1	Northwestern University	50.00
	6	University of Utah	25.00
		Pennsylvania State College	25.00
	12	Creighton University	25.00
		Grinnell College	25.00
		Oklahoma A. and M. College	25.00

	University of Tulsa	25.00
	Washburn College	25.00
	Duke University	25.00
	Texas A. and M. College	25.00
13	Fencing Rules Committee	5.50
15	University of the South	25.00
	John B. Stetson University	50.00
19	St. Louis University	25.00
	University of Wichita	25.00
22	Kansas Athletic Conference	25.00
23	University of Missouri	25.00
29	Georgia School of Technology	25.00
30	Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	25.00
Dec. 4	Royalty on Basketball Rules	168.63
8	Rennselaer Polytechnic Institute	25.00
18	Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference	25.00
19	Football Coaches Association—program	15.00
21	Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association	25.00
22	Interest from Savings Bank	45.21
		\$11,652.00

CR.

1934		
Jan.	1 Stevens Hotel, convention expenses	\$57.26
	F. W. Nicolson, convention expenses	80.00
	Pelton & King, printing	113.16
2	Wesleyan Univ. Alumni Council, addressing	3.00
	Whitehead & Hoag, convention expenses	31.15
4	Lois Smith, copying	.75
	Bank exchange	.10
8	R. E. O'Brian, convention expenses	29.95
	Master Reporting Co., convention expenses	111.89
9	E. H. Lindley, convention expenses	32.30
	Bank exchange	.10
	Wesleyan Store, postage	4.50
12	T. N. Metcalf, track rules committee	102.64
18	J. L. Griffith, telegrams	7.96
	Stevens Hotel, convention expenses	5.10
	C. M. Updegraff, committee on Federal tax	33.51
22	L. W. St. John, expenses to Olympic Assoc.	46.82
26	D. L. Hoffer, gymnastic rules committee	78.10
27	Princeton Univ. Press, handbook	24.87
Feb. 2	F. W. Nicolson, executive committee	18.00
7	Wesleyan Store, postage	1.50
	W. J. Bingham, executive committee	37.00
	Harvard Club of New York, executive committee	48.90
	J. L. Griffith, executive committee	100.00
8	H. W. Clark, soccer committee	70.00
9	Pelton & King, printing and postage	916.64
	Frank McCormick, committee on Federal tax	147.15
12	Wesleyan University, addressing	4.50
19	W. J. Bingham, football rules committee	120.15
22	Bank exchange	.25
	Ray Morrison, football rules committee	63.90
	D. X. Bible, football rules committee	104.35
	Princeton Univ. Press, boxing rules	29.37
27	Government tax on cheques	.64
Mar. 1	Pelton & King, printing and postage	41.00

3	C. H. Smith, football rules committee	125.40
6	L. W. St. John, executive committee	75.16
7	W. G. Crowell, football rules committee	78.60
	W. S. Langford, football rules committee	122.83
	H. J. Stegeman, football rules committee	101.27
	Wesleyan Store, postage	4.78
13	Bank exchange	.12
24	A. A. Stagg, football rules committee	180.08
	J. L. Griffith, president's office	9.83
28	C. M. Updegraff, committee on Federal tax	1.80
29	E. Cowie, stenographic work	50.00
Apr. 2	C. F. Foster, wrestling rules committee	75.43
	R. G. Clapp, wrestling rules committee	93.47
	Frank McCormick, committee on Federal tax	187.09
6	F. W. Luehring, swimming rules committee	47.35
7	J. A. Rockwell, wrestling rules committee	93.56
	E. G. Schroeder, wrestling rules committee	50.49
10	W. R. Okeson, football rules committee	110.00
12	D. B. Swingle, wrestling rules committee	114.70
16	H. S. Ulen, swimming rules committee	92.68
	J. L. Griffith telegrams	3.15
18	L. W. St. John, basketball rules committee	100.16
24	Wesleyan University, telephone	1.00
26	H. G. Crisp, basketball rules committee	84.18
May 3	J. W. St. Clair, basketball rules committee	132.95
	J. F. Bohler, basketball rules committee	44.75
	Pelton & King, printing	3.50
4	Oswald Tower, basketball rules committee	32.00
	F. C. Allen, basketball rules committee	155.72
	Wesleyan Store, postage	4.00
11	A. E. Eilers, swimming rules committee	43.45
14	W. E. Meanwell, basketball rules committee	121.76
June 2	Pelton & King, printing and postage	60.26
4	R. J. H. Kiphuth, swimming rules committee	84.26
8	J. Stubbs, ice hockey rules committee	33.03
11	J. L. Griffith, expenses to Olympic Assoc.	82.05
12	Wesleyan University, addressing	1.00
13	F. W. Nicolson, secretary's allowance	500.00
	L. W. St. John, expenses to Olympic Assoc.	58.16
14	J. E. Lowrey, ice hockey rules committee	35.00
23	F. W. Nicolson, meeting of four secretaries	20.00
	Wesleyan Store, postage	3.50
July 6	Wesleyan Store, postage	4.50
18	Yahmundais Golf Club, ice hockey rules committee	30.00
	L. F. Keller, ice hockey rules committee	36.60
Aug. 10	Pelton & King, printing	6.25
Sept. 5	Government tax on cheques	1.00
6	G. L. Rider, committee on recruiting	58.92
	Z. G. Clevenger, committee on recruiting	55.27
15	Wesleyan University, addressing	1.00
25	Wesleyan Store, postage	4.50
27	F. W. Nicolson, executive committee	10.00
28	E. Cowie, stenographic work	50.00
Oct. 3	J. L. Griffith, executive committee	78.05
5	Harvard Club of New York, executive committee	22.60
	Pelton & King, printing	53.70
8	L. W. St. John, executive committee	61.16
12	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegrams	1.56
24	Bank exchange	.15
Nov. 1	Hazen's Bookstore, library cards	1.40

	22	Wesleyan Store, postage	4.00
		Government tax on cheques26
	29	Bank exchange22
Dec.	7	T. N. Metcalf, track rules committee	18.38
	12	Sportsmanship Brotherhood, dues	10.00
		American Olympic Association, dues	400.00
	13	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegrams	2.90
	15	Wesleyan University, addressing	1.00
		C. L. Brewer, vice-president's expenses	14.50
	20	Bank exchange10
	27	Amount carried forward	5,038.95
			<u>\$11,652.00</u>

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTIETH ANNUAL
CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COL-
LEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION,
DECEMBER 27-28, 1935

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Officers of the Association - - - - -	2
Rules Committees for 1936 - - - - -	3
Roll of Members - - - - -	6
Delegates and Visitors present - - - - -	13
Proceedings of Convention of 1935 - - - - -	16
Reports of Districts - - - - -	21
Reports of Rules Committees:	
Association Football (Soccer) - - - - -	39
Basketball - - - - -	40
Boxing - - - - -	42
Fencing - - - - -	44
Football - - - - -	44
Gymnastics - - - - -	48
Ice Hockey - - - - -	48
Lacrosse - - - - -	49
Swimming - - - - -	50
Track and Field - - - - -	55
Wrestling - - - - -	55
Reports of Special Committees:	
Federal Admissions Tax - - - - -	60
Addresses at the Convention:	
Presidential Address—John L. Griffith - - - - -	61
Joseph E. Raycroft - - - - -	68
General Palmer E. Pierce - - - - -	77
C. L. Brewer - - - - -	81
W. E. Forsyth - - - - -	81
B. W. Bierman - - - - -	83
Report of Round Table Conference - - - - -	85
Report of Treasurer for 1935 - - - - -	114